

INSIDE: LESBIAN MOTHERS • THE SIXTIES

BREAKTHROUGH

POLITICAL JOURNAL OF PRAIRIE FIRE ORGANIZING COMMITTEE

VOLUME XII No. 1

SUMMER 1988

\$1



INTERVIEWS WITH KWAME TURÉ (Stokely Carmichael) AND CHOKWE LUMUMBA

Table of Contents

-
- 1 Editorial: THE UPRISING
-
- 3 WHAT HAPPENS TO A DREAM DEFERRED?
-
- 7 NO JUSTICE, NO PEACE—The Black Liberation Movement 1968–1988
Interview with Chokwe Lumumba, Chairman, New Afrikan People's Organization
Interview with Kwame Turé, All-African People's Revolutionary Party
-
- 17 FREE THE SHARPEVILLE SIX
-
- 26 Lesbian Mothers: ROZZIE AND HARRIET RAISE A FAMILY
-
- 33 REVISING THE SIXTIES
Review of Todd Gitlin's *The Sixties: Years of Hope, Days of Rage*
-
- 38 BEHIND THE U.S. ECONOMIC DECLINE
by Julio Rosado, Movimiento de Liberación Nacional Puertorriqueño
-
- 46 CAN'T KILL THE SPIRIT
Political Prisoners & POWs Update
-
- 50 WRITE THROUGH THE WALLS
-

Breakthrough, the political journal of Prairie Fire Organizing Committee,
is published by the John Brown Book Club,
PO Box 14422, San Francisco, CA 94114.
This is Volume XXII, No. 1, whole number 16.
Press date: June 21, 1988.

Editorial Collective:
Camomile Bortman
Jimmy Emerman
Judy Gerber
Judith Mirkinson
Margaret Power
Robert Roth

Cover photo: Day of Outrage, December 1987, New York.
Credit: Donna Binder/Impact Visuals

We encourage our readers to write us with comments and criticisms.
You can contact Prairie Fire Organizing Committee by writing:
San Francisco: PO Box 14422, San Francisco, CA 94114
Chicago: Box 253, 2520 N. Lincoln, Chicago, IL 60614

Subscriptions are available from the SF address.
\$6/4 issues, regular; \$15/yr, institutions.
Back issues and bulk orders are also available.
Make checks payable to John Brown Book Club.
John Brown Book Club is a project of the Capp St. Foundation



*It is much easier for you
To pass an elephant through a needle's eye,
Or catch fried fish in a galaxy,
Plough the sea,
Force a crocodile to speak
Than to destroy by persecution
The shimmering glow of a belief.
Or check our march,
One single step...*

*Here we have a past,
A present,
A future.
Stay we will, like a thousand prodigies,
In Lidda, in Ramlah, in the Galilee.
Strike deep in the earth
Our living roots. — Tawfiq Zayyad*

The Uprising

In April, the bloody hand of the Mossad, the Israeli CIA, struck down Khalil al-Wazir (Abu Jihad), Deputy Commander of the P.L.O., in a hail of over 100 bullets in front of his wife and child, while one of the assassins videotaped the murder. It was a vain attempt to silence the Uprising (*intifadeh*) in the West Bank and Gaza, by killing the P.L.O. leader charged with coordinating external support for the struggle. The immediate response was massive demonstrations in the Occupied Territories with twelve Palestinians killed by Israeli troops. Hundreds of thousands of Palestinians flooded the streets of Damascus, Syria in an outpouring of grief and rage at the assassination, chanting "The martyr's blood will be avenged."

There have been rebellions in the Occupied Territories many times over the past 21 years. And Israel has always managed to suppress them. Now, in desperation at their inability to silence the Uprising, they have pulled out all the stops—the assassination of a top P.L.O. leader, the detention of 5,000 people, forced expulsions of dozens of leaders, and the killing of hundreds of demonstrators. Yet they have failed to stop the advance of the Palestinian people.

The Uprising has changed the terms of the Palestinian struggle forever. Not since the 1936 rebellion against British colonialism have the Palestinian people risen up so broadly. With courage and sacrifice they have declared their commitment to return to their land and achieve self-determination and nationhood. The Uprising has deepened the unity within the P.L.O. and given rise to new forms of resistance. Mass-based popular committees are more and more assuming leadership of the struggle, hand in hand with the P.L.O. After forty years of consistent attempts to annihilate the Palestinian national identity, after 21 years of military occupation, Palestine Lives!

The Uprising is a lesson in the power of national liberation. Neither the massive exile of Palestinians in 1948, nor the decimation since 1967 of the economy, culture and society of the West Bank and Gaza, has been able to tear out the living roots of the people. A generation raised under occupation has proven that the Palestinian liberation struggle is not simply

the work of a few outside agitators and "terrorists." The Uprising is the answer of hundreds of thousands of Palestinians to twenty-one years of oppression under Israeli occupation.

At the same time, the revolutionary upsurge in the Occupied Territories is the result of political advances within the Palestinian movement. Following the expulsion of the P.L.O. from Lebanon in 1982, Palestinian revolutionaries realized the necessity of basing their organizing within the Occupied Territories. As well, the P.L.O. has reunited on a firmer basis. They reject any "solutions" which would compromise their independence, such as allowing themselves to be represented by Jordan in negotiations with Israel. The ability of the political leadership in the West Bank and Gaza to sustain the Uprising in the face of Israeli terror is testimony to the importance of this process.

The demands of the Palestinian people are clear. They want self-determination and an independent Palestinian state. They have proclaimed that the P.L.O. is their sole legitimate representative and have called for an international conference involving the P.L.O. with the goal of ending the Occupation.

Israeli and U.S. policy arrogantly dismisses these aspirations. The stated position of Secretary of State Shultz is 1) no negotiations with the P.L.O.; 2) no independent Palestinian state; and 3) no withdrawal to the pre-1967 borders. The seeming rift between Israel and the U.S. over the formula "land for peace" disguises a basic unity. A week after the Abu Jihad assassination, the U.S. reaffirmed Israel's special status as the "51st state" by signing accords which extended for five years all recent economic, political and military agreements between the two countries. These agreements are worth billions of dollars to Israel, which could not stay afloat without massive infusions of U.S. aid, military contracts, and contributions from U.S. Zionists.

The Uprising has also revealed once again the naked brutality which is the underpinning of the state of Israel. Scenes of armed soldiers holding down Palestinian youths and systematically breaking their hands, arms and legs with rocks and two-by-fours, or burying Palestinians alive under tons of dirt are shocking in the extreme. But, despite what the Israeli publicists claim, these are not aberrations. Israel requires force and violence to maintain its occupation of Palestinian land. The savagery which the Israelis express flows directly from the colonial nature of Israel.

Zionist colonization of Palestine began in the late 1800s, the same period as the division of Africa among the European powers. Zionist settlement was supported by the British as an outpost of Western imperialism in a region coveted for its geopolitical value and its natural resources, particularly oil. Just as apartheid ideology held that the Afrikaners came to an uninhabited region of Southern Africa (or U.S. "manifest destiny" held that most of

America was an underpopulated territory just waiting for Europeans), Zionism claimed that Palestine was "a land without a people for a people without a land." Zionist arrogance continues to reflect the view that the Palestinians have no national rights and are somehow less than human. Israeli Prime Minister Shamir recently referred to them as "grasshoppers trying to fight an elephant."

Despite the overtly racist nature of Zionism and the direct links between Israel and South Africa, for years the question of Palestine has been too controversial for most of the movement to touch. For those of us who are Jewish, questioning the nature of Israel meant having furious fights with our parents and friends; it meant being called "self-hating anti-Semites." Despite the consistent work of the Palestine solidarity movement, coalition after coalition refused to raise demands about Palestine or allow Palestinian speakers for fear of alienating supporters of Israel in the labor, peace and religious communities. The stranglehold of Zionism over U.S. society has been virtually complete. In the view of the mainstream media and "opinion leaders," Palestinians and the P.L.O. have been identical with terrorists. Period.

Now the Uprising has given us a chance to shatter these assumptions. Many people have been horrified by what they have seen on the evening news and have started to question their unqualified acceptance of Israel. The defenders of Israel realize the danger in this situation, and have already acted to cut off our access to the Palestinian message. In a tactic borrowed from South Africa, we are no longer seeing the rebellion in the Occupied Territories on our television sets at night. The P.L.O. Information Office in Washington was shut down last year and the U.S. is closing the P.L.O. Observer Mission at the U.N. in defiance of international law. Palestinian activists in the U.S. are under threat of deportation.

Despite these repressive actions, the Palestinian message is finally getting through. Thousands of people have demonstrated at Israeli consulates and U.S. corporations that supply weapons to Israel. Activists in Berkeley are trying to create a sister city relationship with Jabalya, a refugee camp in Gaza. There is a growing recognition among progressive people that we should be actively building political and material solidarity with the Palestinian revolution and challenging Zionism.

Palestine needs to be on all of our agendas—whether we are part of the peace, anti-intervention, or solidarity movements. Our direct actions can target Israeli military aid to repressive regimes, such as South Africa, Guatemala and Honduras. Major multi-issue coalitions should include demands in support of the P.L.O. and against the Occupation. We must oppose all attacks on Palestinian activists in the U.S. and defend the right of the P.L.O. to observer status at the U.N. The Uprising is challenging all of us to act. □

What Happens to a Dream Deferred?



credit: Bill Biggart

by Felix Shafer

Two decades after the murder of Martin Luther King Jr., pervasive racism is combining with poverty and powerlessness to create conditions for a renewal of the Black liberation struggle. Eight dismal years of right-wing power, so dedicated to militarism and burying the anti-racist promise of the 1960s, have brought the Reagan era near to its end. Beneath the surface calm, signs that Black people are seeking to reassert their struggle are beginning to appear. This Spring, an unprecedented mobilization of the Black vote won the South for Jesse Jackson on Super Tuesday, launching him as a force within the Democratic Party. And it is Black people's search for empowerment which has kept his fading campaign against the Democratic establishment going, even after Dukakis sewed up the nomination in the California and New Jersey primaries. From coast to coast, Black students occupied campus buildings, protesting white su-

premacy in South Africa and here in racist America. During the past two years there have been more demonstrations by Black/African Student Unions against the racist educational system and attacks by white students than in the entire previous decade. In the New York area, thousands of Black people have taken to the streets, chanting "No Justice, No Peace."

More than a generation has passed since Black people rose up from Selma to Detroit, determined to end racist domination in the segregationist South and the "liberal" North. Then, the cries of "Freedom Now and Black Power" signalled a grassroots rebellion which rapidly transformed the powerlessness felt by the Black "minority" into fertile ground for revolution. With Malcolm X, the message of revolutionary nationalism electrified the descendants of African slaves, bringing a vision of a future where Black people could win the right to deter-

mine their own destiny. In that short, intense span leading up to King's death in 1968, the dynamism of the freedom movement combined with resistance to the war in Vietnam to engulf the system in all-round crisis.

Black consciousness rejected assimilation into white America as incapable of solving racist oppression. This movement could never be satisfied by merely changing discriminatory laws and official attitudes; it aimed for freedom. The Dream was for deliverance from the nightmare of 20th century slavery, and nothing less than a radical transformation of all oppressive economic and social relationships would do. Public opinion polls taken in 1968 showed large numbers of Black people willing to go beyond non-violence, affirming Black/African culture, and understanding that Black people are a subject, colonized people with the right to self-determination. By the late 1960s many dedicated revolutionaries embraced national liberation and the struggle to create an independent Black Nation—New Afrika—as the only way their people could ever be free.

For the first time in generations, white people actually stopped to consider what our lives would have been like if we had been born Black. The conscience of many white people woke to the reality that the evils of racism are rooted in imperialism, and we too were propelled from passivity to confrontation. Not since the days of the Abolitionists and the Emancipation Proclamation had hopes run so high that the system of white supremacy might finally be defeated.

SUBVERTING THE DREAM

Only weeks before Dr. King was murdered, two documents outlining government counter-insurgency policy towards the Black struggle were approved in Washington. The first, for public consumption, was the now-famous Kerner Commission Report on the Causes of Civil Disorders, which admitted what by then had become obvious: after three centuries, white supremacy was so deeply embedded that America really contained two societies—one Black, one white, separate and unequal. In its conclusion, the report predicted that if the U.S. ignored the need for fundamental change, this situation would worsen and become irreversible. The government's response was both sophisticated and predictable: to adopt the rhetoric of change and carry out reforms with as minimal damage to the system as possible. Epoch-making civil rights legislation to do away with apartheid-like racial barriers was the highly publicized concession.

Unwilling to accommodate the radical demand for Black political power, the government put forward Black capitalism and assimilation as the alternative. For a brief period of time, funds were poured into high profile poverty and job training programs. The middle class was

expanded to include a relatively small but influential number of Black people. Some space was opened up, primarily at the city and state level, for Blacks to be elected to office. Still, in a country where at least 15 percent of the population is Black, the six thousand Black officials of today represent less than two percent of all who get elected. Over the years, these officials have been voted in by Black people seeking basic change. But even the most principled among them, like the late Mayor Harold Washington of Chicago, have lacked the power to eliminate white supremacy or radically improve the lives of their people. Others, such as Wilson Goode of Philadelphia, have distinguished themselves by dropping bombs on the Black community.

The second document was crafted in secret under the cloak of national security. Implemented by the FBI, it was named COINTELPRO: a blueprint for a domestic "dirty war" aimed at discrediting and destroying the entire thrust of Black struggle. In black and white, COINTELPRO targeted civil rights and Black nationalist organizations alike, destroying both as rapidly as possible. Today, many of the strongest fighters for Black liberation, like Geronimo Pratt, Sundiata Acoli, Sekou Odinga and others, remain locked down inside U.S. prisons. In all the discussions taking place in the media over the fate of Black people's "Dream of Freedom," the Kerner Report is taken as the yardstick for evaluating progress or the lack of it. But the impact of COINTELPRO's broad assault on Black people and their institutions is conveniently ignored.

REINVENTING HISTORY

For most whites, the upheaval which overturned Jim Crow segregation as the official ideology and law of the land seems little more than a vague episode in American history. This isn't surprising. The media and the government have spent years constructing an official mythology of the period, designed to convince us that the movement won the battle to replace the oppressive hierarchy of white supremacy with a new system based on equality and integration.

In this mass culture, where television conditions our consciousness, overtly racist images of Black life have changed in many ways. Entertainers like Michael Jackson "cross-over" and achieve mega-stardom. Amos 'n' Andy are no longer acceptable, but Eddie Murphy as Beverly Hills Cop is. Television sit-coms project warm success stories about wealthy white parents adopting precocious Black children. And the Cosby show is the perennial top-rated program. Its unthreatening portrayal of the Black middle class is broadcast worldwide, including South Africa, to show how far Black people can come under U.S. democracy. All in all, modern propaganda has



Anti-Klan activists confront the KKK in Virginia.

proven remarkably effective in creating the illusion that racism is of declining significance. For two decades, it has endowed shaky pledges of equality and reform with the appearance of substance.

Considering the role of the media in our lives, it isn't hard to see why most white people have come to view racism as a personal/psychological problem and not as an ever-present system of domination. It's understandable that most anti-racist whites see integration as the solution to inequality and racism. But we need to distinguish between our desire for a country in which there is equality and harmony among nationalities, and the process by which this might ever come about.

Equality can't be achieved by changing laws and altering superficial cultural stereotypes. It is a material, social and political relationship. Look at U.S. history: slavery was abolished over a century ago; the 13th, 14th and 15th amendments to the Constitution were passed; yet equality did not result. Today, integration supposedly exists, and Black people cannot be barred from education, housing,

jobs or medical care on the basis of race.

But when we look at the deplorable quality of schools, neighborhoods, employment and hospitals in the Black community, it's not integration, but a "new" segregation, that we see. It's risky for Black people to venture into white enclaves of many cities. Black families who move into all-white neighborhoods get their homes attacked. This system never did and never will allow the kind of changes at the base of society which are necessary for Black and white people to live in a relationship of equality. Pointing to the failure of integration, Malcolm X said: "Ten men can be sitting at a table eating, you know, dining, and I can come and sit down where they're dining... I've got a plate in front of me, but nothing is on it. Because all of us are sitting at the same table, are all of us diners? Just being at the table with others who are dining doesn't make me a diner."

In our lifetime, the struggles of the 1960s eliminated only the surface, narrow

layer of white supremacy. They were stopped; contained from achieving a real breakthrough, not only by the state, but by the resistance of much of the white population. White supremacy involves more than prejudice and discrimination; at its core is super-exploitation and domination. Established at the time of slavery, it has since fashioned the dynamics of Black oppression into a sophisticated system of colonial control. The racist system of social, economic and political privilege provides white people with a relative, but no less real, stake in perpetuating the domestic colonial status quo over Black, Native, Puerto Rican and Mexican/Chicano peoples. Sometimes subtle, often overt, white privilege extends from the schools children attend, what jobs we get and where we live, to the way we expect to be treated by police, courts, and all institutions. It is why, despite the passage of Civil Rights legislation, the average Black income remains frozen at about half of that of white workers. Most importantly, white supremacy prevents Black people from exercising meaningful power over their lives and

***Sooner or later,
the demands
of the colonized
Black Nation
will force their
way onto the
agenda of the
entire left.***

destiny. This means that, as long as Black people remain a colonized "nation within a nation," the demand for self-determination and independence will be central to their freedom struggle.

THE KERNER COMMISSION REVISITED?

Within the U.S. ruling class, warnings of the explosive potential of Black struggle are again being sounded. On May 24, 1988, a blue ribbon panel, composed of two former U.S. presidents, former cabinet officials, a Governor, a Mayor, top executives of the General Electric Company and Ford Motors, as well as civil rights leaders, issued the report of the Commission on Minority Participation in Education and American Life. Noting that economic and social progress for the majority of Black people has stopped and reversed direction, its conclusion warned of grave consequences for the U.S. in the areas of international competition, social harmony, living standards and even security.

The declining demand for Black labor means that, in addition to being "the last hired and the first fired," millions of Black people will never even have a shot at a productive future in the labor market. The five million Black people, whom mainstream sociologists have dubbed the "underclass," are becoming an endangered, surplus population. These Black youth and Black working class families will never be integrated; they are being put out on the streets, driven into criminal lifestyles, and removed to prison in unprecedented numbers. When scenarios like these are forced on "underdeveloped" Third World countries by the International Monetary Fund, we recognize that a deliberate policy of population control and genocide is happening. In the U.S., it is euphemistically called "letting the market forces set policy."

People sometimes dismiss the Black movement's charges that U.S. policy is genocidal. But how else can we look at the drug plague in the Black community? People are disgusted by the revelations that the CIA and George Bush's office used drugs to finance contra terror in Central America. But inside the U.S., the coverup of the government's motive for allowing drugs to spread continues. The narcotics trade, as a method of controlling colonized people, is as old as selling whiskey to the Indians and the Opium War in China. Twenty years ago, when the Black Power movement raised the slogan, "Uncle Sam is the pusher man," we first learned about how the government and mafia used heroin, smuggled from Southeast Asia, to pacify and criminalize rebellious sectors of the Black community. Now crack is the chemical anti-personnel bomb of the 80s, exploding everywhere in Black and Latino communities. In cities like Los Angeles, the "war on drugs" has done nothing to stop the flow of narcotics. Instead it is a rationale for the police to declare martial law in Black neighborhoods, suspend legal rights and arrest thousands.


On top of all this, racist violence, once considered to be in decline, is now so widespread that even the mainstream media must report on it. The resurgence of the para-military KKK and the specter of white mob violence in Howard Beach, New York, Forsyth, Georgia and Marquette Park, Chicago are difficult for decent people to ignore. Still, with frightening regularity, public opinion polls show that most whites no longer consider racism to be a fundamental problem. We may all live in the same "country," but the economic and social "Great Depression" stalking Black people

continued on p. 44

No JUSTICE No PEACE!

The Black Liberation Movement 1968 - 1988

*Interviews with Kwame Ture
and Chokwe Lumumba*



Interview with

Chokwe Lumumba

Chairman, New Afrikan
People's Organization



Breakthrough is honored to present this interview with Chokwe Lumumba, Chairperson of the New Afrikan People's Organization (NAPO). NAPO grows out of the historic struggle of Black people for human rights and self-determination and has become a leading part of the New Afrikan Independence Movement. NAPO upholds the right of New Afrikans to self-defense against racist terror. NAPO has deep roots in struggles for Black community control of education and for the full participation of New Afrikan women in the liberation struggle. NAPO supports New Afrikan Freedom Fighters and campaigns to win the freedom of political prisoners and Prisoners of War. NAPO is committed to establishing a sovereign socialist Republic of New Afrika on the lands of the Black Belt—the states of Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia and South Carolina.

For over 20 years, Chokwe Lumumba has been deeply

involved in the development of these politics within the Black Liberation Movement. As a student activist at Kalamazoo College, he co-founded the Black Student Organization and the Black United Front of the City of Kalamazoo in the late 60s. Throughout the 1970s he held various official positions in the Provisional Government of the Republic of New Afrika (PG-RNA), founded in 1968 by Black nationalists from around the United States to give a central voice to the demand for an independent Black Nation. In 1978-79, he co-founded the National Black Human Rights Coalition which led a demonstration of 5,000 New Afrikans at the United Nations in November 1979, protesting U.S. violations of Black people's human rights. He is a founding member of NAPO and its first Chairperson. He is also a committed husband and the father of three children.

A revolutionary Black attorney, Chokwe Lumumba has defended numerous Black political prisoners and Prison-

Overleaf: Jubilant youth celebrate the overturning of segregation in Birmingham, Alabama, 1963. Credit: Charles Moore.

continued on page 18



Interview with

Kwame Turé

*All-African People's
Revolutionary Party*

Although active in the Civil Rights Movement from its earliest years, Stokely Carmichael is most clearly identified with the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC). SNCC was one of the most important Black organizations of the 60s. Throughout its history, SNCC was characterized by its belief in militant direct action and sustained mass struggle as the major force for social change. SNCC built its early reputation through work with the Freedom Rides challenging segregation. It organized large numbers of Northern students to come South to help Blacks register to vote, thereby taking on the local white racist power structures. But even more significantly, SNCC organizers spread to the rural areas of the deep South and helped build alternative institutions, local Black leadership, resistance to oppression and renewed racial pride. SNCC organizers influenced the New Left as they pushed a radicalism based on the need to organize the poor and disenfranchised to take power into their own hands.

In the late 60s, Stokely popularized the concept of

Black Power. Its adoption by SNCC was a critical step in the radicalization of the Black movement, representing a shift from a focus on civil rights and integration to one of national self-determination and Black Liberation. As Chairperson of SNCC, Stokely was targeted by the state and reviled in the white-controlled media. He nonetheless continued his work, gaining widespread influence and support among Black activists.

In 1968, Stokely Carmichael moved to Guinea to build links between African struggles in the U.S. and those on the African continent. Adopting the name Kwame Turé, his work and studies led to his participation in the building of the All-African People's Revolutionary Party, founded by Kwame Nkrumah. In the past years as an organizer for the A-APRP, Dr. Turé has travelled throughout Africa, North and South America, the Caribbean and the Middle East, lecturing and furthering the work of that organization and promoting its goals of Pan-African socialism.

Breakthrough is pleased and honored to present this

Interview with Kwame Turé, conducted in early 1988, in which he discusses the past, present and future of the Black movement in this country. The All-African People's Revolutionary Party can be reached at G.P.O. Box 863, New York, NY 10116.

Breakthrough: *It's now 20 years since the death of Martin Luther King. How do you evaluate the legacy of the civil rights movement?*

Kwame Turé: Well, of course, although we use the term "civil rights movement," we'd like to put Malcolm's words "human rights" in here. So we would want to say that the legacy of the human rights struggle of the 60s in America and King's participation was tremendous. Of course, the most important gains that have been made since the 60s have been in the immaterial aspect of our life, that is to say, in the consciousness of the people. If you look at the material gains, for example 303 mayors, all of these elected officials with no power, then obviously these material gains don't mean very much and are not the real legacy. But the immaterial gains, the consciousness the people have gotten—even from their participation in the political process to arrive at these 303 mayors—this is the real legacy.

Martin Luther King played a great role in helping to bring about this consciousness. One of his greatest contributions is not, as the bourgeois press would like to have us believe, the introducing of non-violence as a weapon in the struggle; his real contribution was that he taught the people how to face the enemy without fear.

Now, King's legacy must be properly understood. It was because of King's non-violent movement that the people could go on to urban rebellions. Once King taught a little sixteen-year-old girl not to be afraid of water hoses and not to be afraid of cattle prods and not to be afraid of police on horseback, and to face them non-violently—once they could face them non-violently—it didn't take anything to face them violently. And not only that, somebody sitting in the North, seeing a little girl facing the enemy non-violently like this, feels that in the North at least he can face them violently. So King's legacy—and the legacy of the 60s—was that it routed the fear out of the African masses in this country.

The 60s took down the segregated signs; it made Africans mayors; it put them on television. These are simple cosmetic changes which mean nothing, but it was these same cosmetics which were part of the material base of inferiority for the African in the country. So the 60s wiped out the material basis for inferiority complexes. We're not saying that they do not still exist to one degree or another, but this legacy today is that a more conscious people face the enemy without fear.

BT: *As a contemporary of King and of Malcolm, how do you assess the contribution of these two great Black leaders, both killed by assassins' bullets?*

KT: The thing that is most impressive about both of them is their sterling honesty. It is for this reason above all that they are so loved. Not only did they love humanity, not only did they love their people, but they were honest, so honest that they could criticize themselves caustically in public. If you were to take a look—I believe it's in King's "Why I Oppose the War in Vietnam"—when he says that there comes a time when caution can become cowardice. Of course, he's criticizing himself for his delay in taking a position against the war in Vietnam. Malcolm, in one of his speeches, says something like, "I have in the past criticized every leader of our people. I have said terrible things about them. I want now to change my ways. I want to ask them to forgive me because we must now work for a united front."

Now, of course, politically, we see different paths and different visions, but why they are both so loved by the people, even though they took different paths, was because of their love of the people and their sterling honesty, which of course made them incorruptible and was one of the primary reasons for their assassinations. Martin Luther King didn't see politically as clearly as Malcolm X. King was a preacher and was heavily indoctrinated with European imperialism's interpretation of Christianity, which emphasizes the meekness of the oppressed. So we could understand how it was difficult.

Also, King's class standing was not that of Malcolm X. King, for all practical purposes, had a bourgeois class background within the African community. But if you look at him throughout his life, he's talking about socialism. After receiving the Nobel Peace Prize, he comes back and says, "I've been to these Scandinavian countries, Sweden and Denmark and they're not as rich as America, but they have free schooling, free education, they have free health care, they have low transportation costs, etc., etc., etc. This is the type of socialism Americans should have." Well, we see he's a little bit confused about socialism in his thinking, but at least his intention is clear, as is the direction in which he's going. And we also see, especially near the end, at the beginning of the Poor People's Campaign, his decision to move more and more towards socialism.

Malcolm too starts off away from socialism. Malcolm's class background, of course, is different from King. For all practical purposes, Malcolm, from early in his life, could be classified as lumpen proletariat. But Malcolm was not befogged by the sentimentalism that could befog King who was cushioned from raw racism, even though he grew up in the South. Malcolm sees much more clearly and Malcolm too also comes to socialism.

Birmingham, Alabama, 1963

Black people fighting for civil rights frequently faced water hoses and police dogs.



credit: Charles Moore

Malcolm has clear instincts. When he speaks about the devil, Malcolm is speaking about capitalism, because the Malcolm who calls the white man the devil is the same Malcolm X who brings the Muslims to act as Castro's bodyguards when Castro comes to the United Nations. Malcolm is supporting Castro who, from the point of view of the Nation of Islam, is a white man. He was befogged in his early life, but he began to see clearer, he saw socialism clearly.

Malcolm, we say, was an Africanist. He saw Africa more clearly than King. His background would help explain that; his father worked for the UNIA*, and the program of the Honorable Elijah Mohammed is heavily drawn from the Honorable Marcus Garvey. So both at the end of their lives were pushing towards socialism. Mal-

colm saw it earlier and more clearly, yet both were determined fighters and were convinced of the inevitability of victory.

BT: As the civil rights and Black liberation movement developed there was a tremendous debate over non-violence as a strategy and the belief that America could be peacefully transformed. How does that struggle affect where the movement is at today?

KT: King, of course, played a crucial role here. We said earlier that King's biggest contribution to the struggle was not to adopt non-violence, but to rout fear out of the people. Of course, the bourgeois press is fond of making it appear that King's greatest contribution to the struggle

*The United Negro Improvement Association (UNIA) was a Pan-Africanist organization with millions of members and with chapters throughout the world. It was organized by

Marcus Garvey in the period after World War I around the slogan: "Africa for the Africans, At Home and Abroad," and led struggles in the U.S., the Caribbean and Africa.

was non-violence.

One of King's errors was to make non-violence a principle, when indeed it is a tactic. This was King's error. King was an honest man and being an honest man he came to compound the error because, being an honest man, he knew that you can't compromise principle. King, once he made non-violence a principle, was forced to say that we must use non-violence at all times under all conditions.

Whites attack sit in demonstrators attempting to integrate a Greensboro, North Carolina, lunch counter, 1960.



King got non-violence from Mahatma Gandhi, and if we were to look at Gandhi, we would see Gandhi himself recognized that it was a tactic.

Gandhi first used the weapon of non-violence in Azania—South Africa—and there he was run out by Smuts, with his non-violence having gained no victories. Of course, in India, there were many reasons for its success, again as a tactic. Perhaps one of the reasons for its success was that Gandhi was facing British imperialism and British imperialists nowhere fought against our colonial movements. They had a little skirmish here or there, like in Kenya against the Mau Mau, but British colonialism was not like French colonialism or Portuguese colonialism. Had Gandhi been facing French colonialism or

Portuguese colonialism the situation certainly would have been different, which again shows that it cannot be applied in all conditions at all times. In addition, if the British didn't deal with Gandhi, they would be forced to deal with the more violent forces surrounding him.

In order for non-violence to work, one of the basic prerequisites is that the enemy must have a conscience; and it is this conscience that will become quickened once the

enemy sees the willingness of the victim to suffer oppression. The error that King was making is that King was fighting capitalism and capitalism has no conscience. There is nothing it will not do for its own interest. So consequently non-violence cannot work against a system that is conscienceless. It can only work against a system that has a conscience. This was the fatal error that King made. He was in a struggle against capitalism, and capitalism has no conscience, knowing only its own interests and pursuing these interests by any means necessary.

So with this error that King made—making non-violence a principle—and with the bourgeois press trying to make the best out of this error, this question of non-violence becomes

such a prominent topic in the revolutionary movement, especially in America. But non-violence is a tactic. Malcolm X is absolutely correct. It can only be a principle in a world which is non-violent and as long as there's violence in the world, then non-violence can at best only be a tactic. Malcolm is correct. We must get our liberation by any means necessary.

And there certainly isn't the slightest question that the African masses in America have not imitated the error of Martin Luther King. As a matter of fact, King's death showed that the masses were in harmony with history and that their love of King would in no way let them be confused by this error. They buried King properly—they burned as many cities as they could get their hands on.

BT: *As a widely known proponent of Black Power, what do you see as its relevance today?*

KT: We're no closer to Black Power today than we were in the 60s, in terms of material reality. In terms of consciousness, we are much closer than ever before. Black Power very simply means that Africans must get together, organize themselves for power. If we're speaking just in terms of bourgeois politics, electoral politics, then it means they must have proportionate power. If we look in the country today, we have 303 mayors, 23 congresspeople, some 6,850 state and county elected officials. And while all of these have elected positions of power, these positions are completely and totally powerless. When an African becomes mayor, the position becomes powerless. The insidious subterfuge that capitalism has played on the people between the 60s and the 80s—giving all these positions of power and taking the power away from the positions—will, because of its cynicism, cause its own destruction when the masses of people direct their wrath against it.

So materially we're as far away from Black Power as we were in the 60s, but immaterially, in terms of consciousness, we're closer to it than ever before. The people see now that the only way you have power is when the masses organize and the only way they can visualize this power is outside of the capitalist system. So their questioning and their lack of faith in the capitalist system is more today than it was in the 60s.

As a matter of fact, in the 60s, if you had told me that if I stopped fighting they would give us the 303 mayors in the biggest cities in the country, I might have signed my life away. It was beyond my wildest imagination. And yet we have less power today than before. Consequently, people see that this is not the avenue through which their problems can be solved. If not this way, how then will we arrive at Black Power? Consequently, they will see the only way to arrive at it is through revolution, through the destruction of the capitalist system.

BT: *Critics have said that the Black Power movement and Black nationalism are divisive. Instead they advocate multi-nationalism. How would you respond to this?*

KT: There are many, especially in America and even the European left in general, who are confused on this issue of nationalism, including many who call themselves Marxist-Leninists. Perhaps they are. Some leftists' confusion is that they take some of the particular aspects of Marxism-Leninism in relationship to Europe and try to make it universal. If a member of the European left says to us that nationalism is reactionary, obviously he means that at this time in Europe it is reactionary and certainly we must accept that, and in the U.S. as well. But to tell us,

where there is a state structure, in Africa for example, trying to construct a nation, that nationalism is reactionary is to understand nothing of life.

We do not understand how people keep saying nationalism is reactionary and divisive when, since World War II, the battering ram against imperialism has been national liberation movements. Consequently we feel sorry for these our comrades who have no understanding, but in no way will they confuse us. These very comrades incidentally, are the first to hold up Malcolm X as a shining example and are the first to condemn us about nationalism.

This question concerning nationalism and the way they pose it is interesting. "Multi-" means many. When one says "multi-nationalism," one means many nationalisms. What they really mean, however, is that they are, through racist ideology, trying to advance white superiority without taking credit for it, under the slogan of revolution.

In order to have multi-nationalism, African nationalism must be restored to its natural healthy state. At this point it's in an unhealthy state. Malcolm X said it best. He said the viciousness of the capitalist system is not that it teaches a man to hate another man but that it teaches you to hate yourself. There's no question here. The inferiority complexes that are imposed upon the African masses are a result of a lack of healthy nationalism. Consequently, for us—and for the African masses worldwide—nationalism is a prerequisite for waging real struggle, even to have a proper comprehension of socialism. Without a proper comprehension of nationalism, we cannot have a proper comprehension of socialism. As a matter of fact, without a proper comprehension of nationalism, we will accept any version of socialism given to us by anybody other than us.

BT: *You're a Pan-Africanist and socialist. Can you explain what led you to this path?*

KT: Well, just a desire to make a contribution to my people's liberation—that's the only way I can answer that question because it's the truth. The experiences I've had in life, the lessons that have been taught to me by the masses of my people have brought me clearly to this path.

Of course, the material aspect of my life would play a crucial role. I myself was born in the Caribbean, on the small island of Trinidad. My mother was born in Panama. I have two sisters who were born in Trinidad with me. I also have two sisters who were born of the same mother, same father who were born in New York.

For me, this question of how to get nationalism out of Panama, Trinidad and America, was very easy. Pan-Africanism was a natural. These experiences of my life, being a young man growing up in the Caribbean, letting the independence movement there have an effect on me,

coming to the U.S., struggling here. Yet while struggling here, keeping up with the struggle in the Caribbean. All of my parents' friends, their social groupings, were those of the Caribbean, so even my young cousins who were there were writing me all the time. They were in the youth movement of the independent parties and I saw the struggle for independence in the Caribbean. I couldn't see separating my own struggle from there. For me, I recognized the struggle as being one and the same.

But aside from this, all the giants of the revolutionary struggle of the African masses have been dipped in Pan-Africanism: Dubois, Padmore, Garvey, Malcolm X, C.L.R. James, Rodney, all of them. So that studying my history I would have to consider Pan-Africanism. It would have to be what I would see as the solution to the problem.

BT: *One of SNCC's unique contributions to the political struggle of the 60s—and a struggle that the A-APRP has carried on—has been the struggle against Zionism. Could you describe that history and how you view the issue today?*

KT: Zionism controls the political entity in America. Politically, no one can dream of becoming president of this country before bowing down before the altar of Israel and giving unconditional support. Of course, for African politicians, they just fall down on their face before the altar. Obviously, as a Pan-Africanist party we have great conflict with the state of Israel. Consequently, as a Pan-Africanist party, there is no possible way for us to avoid confrontation with Zionism. No possible way.

In 1967, when the Israeli war broke out, one of my last acts as chairperson of SNCC was to write out the press release along with one of our sisters attacking Zionism. With this press conference, once it hit the newspaper, I promise you, in three months SNCC was finished. This is where I began to see the power of Zionism.

We had been the first organization to come out and decide to attack the draft in America. We had attacked the Vietnam war without pity and without mercy. We had called Lyndon B. Johnson a buffoon from one end of the country to the next. Yet SNCC prospered. On Black Power, King never condemned us. King always said, "I would never choose the word, I would try another word." As a matter of fact, King was the first to use the term "Black Consciousness." He said, "Why don't you all use the word, Black Consciousness?" He did! I said Black Power may not be nice, but we need it, and still King didn't come out against us.

But once we attacked the state of Israel, SNCC was closed down in three months. Not only did the media go on attack, but the liberals, non-Jewish liberals, were jumping over each other to attack us. The church came out

against us. The white left came out against us. Martin Luther King made the statement that no matter which way you say it, any statement against the state of Israel is anti-Semitic.

We were completely isolated. The African community, all the leaders lined up. King was the most left of those to the right of us, so by the time Wilkins and the others got through with us, you know what we looked like. We were all by ourselves. In three months, financial sources dried up, chaos was everywhere, police were arresting this one and that one. At the same time the press was killing us, the liberals were killing us, everyone. Not only that, by the time they got through with it, they had people apologizing.

We know that Zionism's reins are powerful and supreme in America because it is unchallenged both by the right and by the left. The right is terrified of it and the left has been ideologically neutralized by it. Consequently, the struggle as we know it is a serious struggle. But we say it must be confronted. To show you, the enemy is so powerful that you can find people in America who are genuinely anti-imperialist but who are not at all anti-Zionist. I myself, as a young man, was confused because the way Zionism is presented is as a national liberation movement. And without serious investigation you can be easily lulled to sleep by that.

The only reason that people support Zionism or are neutralized by it is they are totally ignorant of it. They have no understanding of it. The only side people in America are allowed to hear is the Israeli side. They're not even allowed to hear the Palestinian side. So our struggle isn't even a struggle to convince them of the justness or the correctness of the Palestinian struggle. Our struggle is to get them to only look at the Palestinian side. We know once they look at the Palestinian side, the struggle's over, because the justness of the struggle is so glaring that it is only if one is blinded by Zionism that one could not see it.

BT: *Let's shift to the current situation in this country and to the tasks facing the African and white movements today. To begin with, how do you assess the Jesse Jackson campaign?*

KT: Jesse's campaign represents, for us, a reform movement. We are revolutionary, but in no way are we antagonistic to this reform movement. On the contrary, we encourage it, even though we ourselves would not be involved in it. Because for those who have never taken any type of action, this type of reform action can lead them to revolutionary action. We do not believe that reform leads to revolution, but those involved in reform action can be led to revolutionary action. This is the difference we have with many. So in no way do we discourage reform activity.

For us, all the Jackson campaign can do is heighten the political consciousness of the masses of the people and create contradictions inside the Democratic Party. Even if it is not Jackson's intention to do so, his very presence and the line he will be forced to hold will cause this contradiction inside the Democratic Party. The last time at the convention, he asked for three meager demands, reforms. These reforms have not been met up until this point, so

the struggle in the past has been that the white left sought ideological hegemony over the movement. They did not seek practical hegemony in activity, but they did seek ideological hegemony.

Even in the area of reform, from Jesse Jackson's campaign, we can see the redressment of this in the Rainbow Coalition. What the Rainbow Coalition has done is a reflection of the struggles in the country that have put the

Azania/South Africa. The Black movement here has always fought for the freedom of African people everywhere.



Jackson is faced with having to meet these three. In addition, the pressure that will be put on him now to take a more radical position than the other candidates will allow him to polarize the national minorities in the country who are involved in electoral politics and at the same time take the white left and take the white workers and farmers who are confused at this point with the capitalist system and looking for a way out.

BT: In 1966, SNCC made a struggle with its white members that they should leave the organization and organize in the white communities. In this period, with racist terror on the rise, and conditions getting worse on a material level, what do you think white people should be doing?

KT: Let me begin by saying that one of the problems of

national minorities in the position where they command respect, not only practically, but ideologically. The same process has been happening in the progressive struggle over the years, with many people waging the struggles on different levels. Some Africans have said that they must lead the struggle and white people must follow them and take their orders. Others say no, ideologically we must be independent, not have any struggle with the white left. We don't accept any ideological help from them, we're not ideologically dependent on them, we're ideologically independent. I think that this position has reached throughout America. That is to say that even if the white left doesn't even accept it, they have to respect it. Certainly, it is reflected in the Rainbow Coalition because everyone knows that it is led by the Africans.

Now, polarization is going up, so the chance for organizing in the white community is on a higher level and more

ripe than ever before. The white community must become organized, otherwise it's left for the Klan, Reagan, and reactionary forces. Thus the dictum to white forces is clear: 1) the whites who come to work with us must understand African nationalism to one degree or another; 2) they must understand the necessity to organize whites in a progressive and revolutionary manner, not leaving them to be organized by reactionary forces, and 3) they must understand that on these bases, coalitions can properly be formed.

BT: *Currently there is an upsurge of Black student activism on campuses. At Columbia University and elsewhere, Black students are not only confronting Apartheid but are taking to the streets to address police terror. New organizations are forming. Could you talk about this upsurge and about the importance of student organizing today?*

KT: We're a revolutionary party and revolutions are made by three segments: peasants, workers, and revolutionary intelligentsia. It is an undeniable fact that it is the revolutionary intelligentsia who spark revolution. They do not complete it; they cannot carry it through to triumph. Only the masses of the people can do this with the interests of the workers up front. But it's undeniable that it's the intelligentsia that spark it. If we look at the world, struggles everywhere are being sparked by students. In the United States in the 1960s it was the students who sparked it. In Ethiopia, the struggle against Haile Selassie, in Azania—South Africa—students. So students spark struggle everywhere, yet we say they are not capable of bringing it through to the end.

We know the workers are ready at the drop of a hat; they'll fight any time and our community can be easily mobilized. But to keep it organized on a permanent basis is a problem and this is a problem which is the result of lack of ideas, lack of ideology. Students are necessary to spark revolution because revolution deals with overturning of values, and students are at the point of production of values. Their job is to institutionalize the values of a society, whether it's socialist or capitalist. Therefore, once students begin to question the values of the society and have the masses rally around these ideas and, as Marx said, make them material reality, I think you really have revolution. Our party has dedicated itself to producing cadre and to producing revolutionary intelligentsia. That's where we've aimed ourselves for the last twelve years.

In the upsurge this time around we're in a better place than we were in the 60s. In the 60s it was haphazard. But today, we know exactly how to direct it. If you look at Black Power, Black Power was nothing but students going to the sharecroppers in the South; it was the share-

croppers who gave us Black Power, with workers and students combining their forces. Therefore student sparks are crucial. And this time when it sparks in America, it's going to go all the way.

BT: *For our last question, would you like to comment, in retrospect, on some of the major lessons that were learned from the great upsurge by African people in this country during the 60s?*

KT: Many lessons were learned. One is that, when you have a political struggle, you do not depend on moral persuasion to get concessions from the enemy. That's hard line politics. We certainly have learned this. We have learned that coalitions cannot be based on some type of mutual feeling and emotion, but again on hard line cold political reality, facts, interests. What are the interests of this man? What are the interests of that man? How far will they go together on the path they have chosen?

We have come to see for the African masses that we have got to attack our problem seriously. We are a people who have unity of action, but we lack unity of thought. We have so much unity of action that we can rise up, burn down a city in a weekend and then sit back down without planning it, without giving it the slightest thought before doing it and without giving the slightest thought after we've done it. As a people we have great unity of action, but what we lack is unity of thought. People think that in the 60s there was organization in this country. There was not. There was mobilization.

There's a difference between mobilization and organization and this difference must be properly understood. To be an organizer, one must be a mobilizer, but being a mobilizer doesn't make you an organizer. Martin Luther King was one of the greatest mobilizers this century has seen, but until his death he was short on organizing. He came to double up on it just before his death, but he was very short on organizing. Many today who follow in his footsteps still take this path of mobilization rather than organization. Thus one of the errors of the 60s was the question of mobilization versus the question of organization.

Thus we can say then: (1) In a political struggle we cannot depend on moral persuasion to convince the enemy. Political power is the only thing that will move the enemy. (2) We cannot form coalitions based on sentiment. We must form coalitions based on common interest. (3) The African masses have unity of action. They lack unity of thought. Thus the necessity of political education becomes crucial. It is only this unity of thought that will make their struggle permanent, not temporary, not spontaneous. And finally, the spontaneous, instinctive, unconscious action of the 60s must be transformed to planned, conscious, organized activity of the 80s.

FREE THE SHARPEVILLE 6

Black activists in South Africa/Azania continue to pay a heavy price for their ongoing resistance. At this moment, at least 43 Azanian patriots—including those known as the Sharpeville Six—sit on South Africa's death row.

In 1984, years of resistance to apartheid and colonialism exploded into a massive national uprising. The first center of the uprising was Sharpeville, site of the 1960 Sharpeville Massacre. On September 3, 1984, the Deputy Mayor was killed after he shot into a crowd of 2,000, demonstrating against huge rent increases.

Five men and a woman—Mojalefa Sefatja, Oupa Diniso, Reid Mokoena, Dama Khumalo, Francis Mokhele and Theresa Ramashamole—the Sharpeville Six—were arrested as scapegoats. Although the state did not allege that they committed the murder, they were sentenced to death for "sharing a common purpose" with those who killed the puppet official.

This year, as their legal appeals have been exhausted, the freedom of the Six has become one of the most important issues inside South Africa. All progressive forces, spearheaded by the African National Congress and the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania, have fought to save them from the gallows.

In March, a prosecution witness revealed that he was tortured into giving false testimony against the Six. Mounting worldwide pressure forced the judge to stay the executions and consider a new trial. But on June 13, in the wake of the most successful Black general strike ever, the request for retrial was denied. The Six are now appealing directly to the highest level of the Supreme Court. The twists and turns in this case reveal the dilemma of the apartheid regime. Hanging the Six would serve as a violent warning to the Black opposition; at the same time, it would unleash a wave of fury in Azania.

Without concerted efforts to release them, the fascists will move forward with a flood of political executions in the next year. Send mailgrams demanding a new trial and clemency to Ambassador Pieter Koornhof, Embassy of the Republic of South Africa, 3031 Massachusetts Avenue N.W., Washington, D.C. 20008. Bombard the settler government and its U.S. backers with the demands:

**FREE THE SHARPEVILLE SIX!
STOP APARTHEID EXECUTIONS!**



Adapted from a piece by Valeria Maynard

Lumumba, from page 8

ers of War, including: the Pontiac Brothers, 16 Black prisoners charged with the deaths of three white guards during a rebellion at Pontiac Prison, Illinois; members of the Revolutionary Armed Task Force, accused of the October 1980 attempted expropriation of a Brinks truck in Nyack, New York; and Dr. Mutulu Shakur, charged in a second Brinks-related trial (see article on page 47).

In this interview, conducted in February 1988, Chokwe Lumumba reflects on the history and the current state of the Black Nation, the Black Liberation Movement and the struggle for an independent New Afrika. For more information, contact NAPO at P.O. Box 2348, New York, NY 10027; P.O. Box 5698, Los Angeles, CA 90056; P.O. Box 04252, Detroit, MI 48204; or P.O. Box 11464, Atlanta, GA 30310.

Breakthrough: Twenty years ago the U.S. government set up the Kerner Commission to investigate the causes of the Black rebellions in the 60s and one of its most quoted conclusions was that this country was moving towards two societies, one of poor Black people and another of relatively privileged whites. What do you think of this conclusion and do you think Black people have made much progress since the struggles of the 60s?

Chokwe Lumumba: There has always been a separate Black nation here, a separate Black society. And the way that the United States was born and the way that it has maintained itself throughout the centuries has always assured that this was the case and it remains the case now. We have been set upon by an alien power, a power which had no right to control us, ever since we were snatched from Africa, and brought over here and enslaved. So the United States of America represents an invasion of Black people's right to self-determination, our right to make our own decisions, govern ourselves and to provide for a society where we can seek economic justice and a wholesome state of living for everybody in it. And because we're being denied that, then all these other problems arise.

I don't think that much progress has been made. In fact, no progress as it relates to being a dependent people as opposed to an independent people. For the vast majority of our people there's been little or no material progress either. Relative to white people in this country our economic situation now is worse than it was at most points in the 60s. I believe, if the statistics haven't changed much since a couple of years ago, we make only about 54 percent of the average white income. When King died, we were making something like 57 percent as much as white people. Kennedy gave this speech once where he was

saying how two Black children die for every white child from infant mortality. Now in many areas of the country, something like four Black infants die for every one white. It used to be just Mississippi that was used as an example of outrageous inequities. But it's clearly more prevalent now in Detroit, Harlem and other places.

And I could go on and on with the raw facts. We could talk about the fact that 60 percent of the people gunned down by police every year now are Black; that the population of the prisons has doubled and at this point is moving towards tripling and that the vast majority of that increase has been Black; that in most major states where the Black population is above ten percent, the prison population is over 70 percent Black and something like 50 percent of the total prison population in the United States, both federal and state, is Black. So our situation is a bad situation.

BT: How do you respond to the argument of many government officials that the 300 Black mayors and other Black elected officials and the growth of a Black middle class are signs of progress?

CL: The so-called growth of the middle class is no more than an illusory phenomenon. This middle class for the most part has no self-sustaining viability. It is a middle class which exists at the whim and the will of those who control the economic base of the society. It's not even an independent bourgeoisie which is wealthy on its own accord, owns businesses or land of its own, or has political relationships which would require that it stay in the position that it is. The elected officials represent pay checks more than anything else. In most cases they don't represent power.

In the suppression of the movement in the 60s, Nixon and others came up with the so-called Black capitalism program to promote the notion that a person could really get what he was after, not by political struggle, but by getting more and more money in his pocket. In many instances these people, who have found this as a refuge from the normal living of Black people, are becoming increasingly alienated from the Black community and the Black community has become increasingly alienated from them. There is now a small group of people—and really you couldn't define that as the whole "Black middle class"—but a small group within that middle class, who the government can depend upon more than Black people can.

BT: The consciousness of Black people in the U.S. reached a high point in the struggles of the 60s. And when the movement was attacked and repressed by the government, that consciousness really suffered. What do you see happening today?

CL: The lack of activity over the last few years is probably accounted for by a lack of the ability to institutionalize the struggle in our youth. A lot of the youth have been coming up in the classrooms and in front of TV sets which have rewritten history completely, or just been totally ahistorical and have not really inculcated them with any kind of notions which would be necessary for the struggle. That has created not just a lull in struggle but a build in criminal activity and asocial, "apolitical" activity. What I mean by that is that youth, being oppressed, still struggles, but they struggle in individualistic ways. So what that means is the rise in gangland situations, fights over drugs, turf struggles, the kinds of things that happen to any oppressed people in the absence of strong grassroots leadership.

But what's happening now is that the repressive nature of the state and of white civilian armies has spread to the point that even in the absence of organized political leadership the youth are being pushed to the brink of open struggle against the system.

Howard Beach is perhaps one of the greatest examples of it, where many youth began to respond to the cry of "Howard Beach, Howard Beach, Howard Beach" right after that occurred. The attack was viewed as not just on Black people, but in particular on Black youth. Then you have the shooting of Black youth on the subway by Goetz and just the overall way that the system and many people in it relate to Black youth now. And Black youth are given fewer and fewer alternatives nowadays for survival. And this is why they become radicalized. I think that they're essentially a more radical group than even we were.

But the radicalization of the Black youth requires a politicization also. As I defend young brothers and sisters caught up in the system, it's not that they're not radical, it's just that they're not politicized. They do what they do with a vengeance; but they don't do it toward the right targets in many instances. And I'm not just talking about vio-

lence; I'm talking about attitude. And so I think that as they become more politicized on account of the racist violence which is happening—and racist violence does politicize people, there's no question about it—the national identity begins to grow. We begin to see who we are and how we're approached and attacked. And people so set upon are certainly going to respond.

The Day of Outrage which occurred here in New York was a movement in response to all the racist activity which had been occurring—like the rape of Tawana Brawley, a 15-year old Black woman up in Newburg, New York, who was raped and brutalized and her body marked up by white people, probably police officers. Then after the Howard Beach verdict came back, two other Black youth in the Bensonhurst community in

L.A. police sweeps of the Black community have become an everyday occurrence in the "War on Drugs."



March, 1988. One of many demonstrations by Black people in New York calling for justice for Tawana Brawley.



Brooklyn were jumped on and cut up by some white youth. In response to this, the Day of Outrage was called—what the papers called “the surgical disruption of different transportation arteries.” What you had was the subway system closed down at certain points, the bridges were blocked off at certain points, and thousands of people participated.

BT: In light of the rise in racist violence, why do you think the white anti-racist movement is so small?

CL: I think the anti-racist movement is relatively small basically because the Black movement, or the revolutionary New Afrikan independence movement, is relatively quiet. I think that the two things are related. The white anti-racist movement, regardless of how it has seen itself in different periods of time, is like any other movement which is in support of an oppressed struggle. It tends to grow and decline based upon how much fuss, for lack of a better word, the people who are oppressed make. All support is generally contingent upon how great the demand is for support and how great the movement is to be supported.

BT: This is a presidential election year and Jesse Jackson is one of the people running for the Democratic nomination. What is NAPO's view of his campaign?

CL: NAPO's position on Jesse's campaign is this: We're not opposed to Jesse, but we don't support his presidential campaign, just as we don't support the campaigns of any other people running for president. Basically we think that the presidency of the United States itself is not an instrumentality which is going to help us much in our struggle for liberation. You can have a liberal slave master or you can have a conservative slave master, but as long as his position is to be the master of the slave plantation, there's little qualitatively that he or she will contribute to the people's liberation.

It was a difficult decision for us in 1984 to decide that we shouldn't support Jesse Jackson. Because it was a movement among Blacks, an electoral movement albeit, but still a movement. Black people in South Carolina, in Michigan, in a number of other places bucked traditional Democratic caucuses or machines to support Jesse Jackson. The movement was good,

because it had a potential of being a movement away from traditional politics.

But the direction which the leadership of that movement was always leading it in was bad. It became a movement into the system, as opposed to a movement out of the system. And that was demonstrated in many different ways, but perhaps most outstandingly at the National Convention itself where just about everything that Jesse Jackson was supposed to be demanding on behalf of Black people and Third World people internationally was rejected. And at the same time, he did not walk out of that Convention and was content to be given an opportunity to speak, which we didn't think really contributed substantially to the development of a movement amongst our people.

Now there are revolutionaries in this country, revolutionary nationalists, revolutionary New Afrikan communists, and others who say that Jesse Jackson is worth supporting; not because of Jesse Jackson, but because they feel that this is the way at this point in history to build roots in the Black community politically. We are still discussing this with the people who feel this way. But I would have to say that at this time, NAPO does not feel that way. NAPO is also concerned about the fact that we have to have priorities in our struggle. We don't see spending most of our time attempting to plant ourselves inside electoral movements, when our own revolutionary infrastructure has not been built satisfactorily.

BT: Can you talk about the work of the New Afrikan People's Organization, in particular the Centers for Black Survival and the Malcolm X Grassroots Campaign?

CL: NAPO grows out of the heart of the revolutionary New Afrikan nationalist movement. NAPO's roots go as far back as the Black Panther Party, the Revolutionary Action Movement, the Provisional Government of the Republic of New Afrika and the Afrikan People's Party. All those things have contributed to what is now the New Afrikan People's Organization.

When we talk about the Centers for Black Survival, it's about NAPO, a cadre of trained revolutionary nationalists, extending itself into the community and organizing centers of resistance amongst our people. The Centers for Black Survival represent a physical place in the community, as well as a center of action. For example we have a youth program in everything from recreational activities, softball teams, camping, outdoor survival, to martial arts to history to revolutionary nationalist thought, and education—arithmetic, reading—and a number of other things. Out of the Centers we have built specifically a New Afrikan Scout program, which is for youth 7-13, and a New Afrikan Panther program, which is for the older

youth up to 18 or so. And these youth are engaged in many different forms of organization, as it relates to learning how to think, learning how to physically prepare themselves for the struggle which is ahead.

We find that through the Centers for Black Survival we are also able to bring together people for forums to discuss contemporary issues of the day and to have a place where we can begin to organize people for action in the community. Out of the Centers for Survival, we have developed certain crime prevention programs, street patrols which go out into the community and try to compromise the drug peddlers as well as the people who might be burglarizing or injuring the community in different ways. Out of the Centers for Black Survival, we have developed programs to struggle against utility exploitation. In Detroit we literally forced the gas company in about 50 or 60 cases to turn people's gas back on and to leave people's gas on, in a city where older people have been known to freeze to death because of the company exploiting them. We have used the Centers for Black Survival to organize against right-wing activity, like in California. People from the Center have been organized to go out and to participate in various different agitational activity against white racists. We have seen our unit here in New York, which is not actually in a Center yet, work in a similar fashion.

What we see in developing the Centers for Black Survival is a center of activity, a spirit of activity in the Black community. The Centers branch out into homes; it's not just what happens in the Center, but we take some of the Center programs into the neighboring homes, into the blocks, and hopefully into the block clubs or wherever we can get the programs, into some of the other organizations which are in the community. Here in New York for instance we had a drive to change the name of Lennox Avenue to Malcolm X Boulevard, and that was a kind of an activity which had to grow out of our center of activity into other people's organizations to get support. We were successful in that; we got the name changed.

The Malcolm X Grassroots Campaign is an effort to hook up, connect a number of the local struggles which are arising at this time. In some instances, you will find NAPO actually engineering a campaign around a particular issue. But it also involves us identifying actions which are occurring already and trying to hook them up under the banner of the Malcolm X Grassroots Campaign. And so it's an effort to create a campaign which helps to increase the national consciousness of people, with different local actions being hooked up into the national activity.

BT: Assata Shakur, who is now living in Cuba and has been granted political asylum there, has just published an autobiography. Can you talk about her importance to the struggle?

CL: I think her importance to our struggle is immense. It begins with the fact that she was such a strong warrior and that, despite the odds against her and many of her comrades, she struggled on. She was in the Black Panther Party which was being destroyed by the government, by force and by the ability to infiltrate and destroy from inside. Rather than quit in despair, she left the Black Panther Party and became part of the Black Liberation Army, which struggled against the drug traffic and in support of Blacks against financial institutions which oppress us as Afrikan people here in America, as well as against police officers who kill us and who abuse us.

And her struggle was one which subjected her to the wrath of the American government and the states of New Jersey and New York. And because she has been such a champion of the people's rights, the people respond. And when she goes to trial in something like eight different cases, they're

either dismissed or she's found not guilty. And then what happens is they have to retreat to the dungeons of white supremacy and they take her to New Jersey to an all-white jury. She's convicted of killing a police officer despite medical records which show there's no way she could have killed him, because she was already shot and paralysed at the time. But she is convicted by this all-white jury and given life plus 30 years.

So that makes her important, because at this point she becomes one of the more clearly abused political prisoners and Prisoners of War inside of the jails. And indeed, COINTELPRO information, which would be forthcoming subsequent to her conviction, would show that the government had tried to make her an enemy of the people, to prejudice the press against her and to accuse her of everything to make it look like she was involved in things which they knew clearly she wasn't involved in. There's a secret memorandum which



BT: We hear a lot about the different trends that King and Malcolm represented in the freedom struggle. How do we understand now what that debate was really about and what its relevance is to the movement today?

CL: Martin Luther King represented people's struggle against the failure of the system to provide democratic rights to Black people, essentially, a struggle against Jim Crow. His activism, his mobilization of hundreds, thousands, even millions of people to the streets provided the kind of leverage which we needed in the Black movement in order to confront the system, to actively engage the population in struggle against the colonizers, against the United States in its various manifestations of white supremacy.

What is usually characterized as being King is only King in the early stages of development. As he stood in Washington, D.C. and talked about having a dream, basically what King was doing was reflecting basic humanitarian instincts which say that all people in this world should get along together and share the wealth in the society and nobody should be discriminated against.

But as his life unfolded, he began to see the international nature of Black people's struggle; he began to speak of the struggle in the same breath as he spoke of revolutions in Africa and other parts of the world.

discloses that to be the case.

And so, finally, what happens is her liberation in 1979. I think that the liberation could have happened to some other people, but certainly no one more appropriate than Assata Shakur. And so when she is liberated, that again is something that Black people need to celebrate. Her liberation is not an act that is achieved exclusively because of the will and the good planning and good work of others outside of the prison. Here again she shows what she is made of, to participate in it and to help make it a success, as she did. And then once she is freed, she manages to successfully elude the grasp of the enemy and winds up in Cuba, which we would have to say today is one of the most progressive societies in the world. And so I think that she's a living model of success in our movement and of the kind of people we must show to our children, the kinds of personalities that we have to exemplify in our movement.

He began to say that he supported these revolutions. He also began to oppose the war in Vietnam. And domestically, internally, he recognized Black Power as being a whole-some phenomenon before he died. He was beginning to understand the national character of Black people's struggle, as a group of people if not as a nation.

King's pre-occupation with non-violent tactics can only be seen as an exercise for the historical moment. It would be difficult to believe that even he would have remained in favor of that point of view. It's just not a mature point of view as far as winning the struggle is concerned. And I'm not saying that to be derogatory to him. It actually was a tactic of some distinction for a period of time. It did get the people's attention around the world; it did perhaps put more people in motion than would have been put in motion if they would have felt that there was going to be anything but non-violence.

But we certainly outgrew it. When you begin to get repression from the state in terms of dogs and hoses and all forms of overt violence, your non-violent tactic is seen as weakness as opposed to strength. When babies are blown up in Birmingham, Alabama, obviously it's time for other developments.

And so what Malcolm basically did is talk about self-defense. An extension of self-defense is national resistance; you not only defend your immediate situation, but you have a right to defend the people's national sovereignty and national integrity, which means a liberation struggle, an offensive struggle by an armed revolutionary military formation. And that is what we recognize that we have a right to do now.

Malcolm understood all this completely. Malcolm, way before King died, spoke of Black people as a nation, and spoke of the struggle for freedom and liberation of that nation, and understood that it was a question of human

BT: *As white anti-imperialists we meet a lot of people who are against racism, but question whether it's really possible for Black people to achieve self-determination. Why does NAPO believe that this strategy can develop mass support and ultimately succeed inside the United States?*

CL: One reason is that we don't think there's an alternative to the successful liberation of Black people in America—or for a successful contribution toward the liberation of people in the world by Black people in America.

It's quite clear to us that there is no basis at this point in time for a kind of cross-national solidarity with workers which could just overthrow the United States government and establish a society where Black people would be equal and free. We don't think that the material basis is there for white people to strike out against the state, which basically has them in complicity, in a white supremacist alliance. The

rights. What King added, and what Malcolm perhaps didn't add, was the actual physical confrontation with the system by masses of people.

When Malcolm X raised the question of human rights, he understood that it's not just a question of what the United States constitution will do for us, or any other document or law or lawyer or legal institution that the American government has. The question is greater than that; the question is whether the United States government has a right to be making laws about us, period. Malcolm basically represented the moving of the struggle from a period of a civil rights struggle to contesting the system's control of us, to actually questioning colonialism itself.

Malcolm can largely be considered as the person responsible for the initiation of that process. With his departure from the Nation of Islam, he influenced many young people who were in the Revolutionary Action Movement, who were in SNCC. They began to change the character of the civil rights movement to the Black Power movement which then developed into the Black liberation movement. We like to think this culminated in a clear political expression of where we're going as a people in 1968 when the Provisional Government of the Republic of New Afrika was founded and the aim to build an independent Black nation in America in modern times was clearly and unequivocally articulated.

Today, with the benefit of hindsight, we can understand that there is a certain logic, a certain unity in the people's movement, a certain progression from one stage to the next. And if we look at Malcolm and King, and we look at the way that the FBI interpreted them—both as threats to the American system and to the American oppression of Black people—then I think we can come to the conclusion that today we should respect and love both of them as heroes of our people.

“Once Black people decide we will not be controlled by the U.S.A, that we will be free and independent, they cannot stop us.”

—Chokwe Lumumba

material basis is not there because white people basically are in a better position materially because of the oppression of Black people. And if we are good dialectical materialists, our analysis would have to tell us that before that situation is going to change then white people have to perceive their material situation to be decidedly disadvantaged by the fact that they are not aligned with the struggle for oppressed peoples' rights. And right now that's not the case.

Only when Black people and other oppressed nations which exist in the confines of the American empire struggle against this oppression and their colonization will white people's material conditions begin to change. Because the struggle against the oppression of Black people will create a burden on the United States government, which will, in turn, become a burden on those who support it.

That burden itself will have to be reassessed by white people. And that will give white revolutionaries more fertile ground for organizing their people to understand that in an objective way the struggle for liberation of Black people is, in fact, inevitable—and that their best interests fundamentally are in a *better* world, not in oppressing Blacks in *this* world.

Going back to Africa is plausible for some individuals and some groups of individuals, and actually even advisable for some people to contribute to the struggle on the African continent. We don't object to that at all. For the masses of Black people, though, it is not an objective reality. And, of course, that solution avoids the fact that in order for African liberation to become a reality or liberation anywhere to become a reality, the beast right here must be slain.


We think that absolute liberation will occur in terms of New Afrika only when the empire is dismantled. Some people feel that New Afrika can be free even if the rest of the empire is left intact. But that's not our view. That's not to suggest that we cannot reach a level of progression toward complete national liberation without the whole empire being dismantled. But it is to say that our fate therefore is tied to the struggles of other oppressed people within the empire, the Puerto Ricans, the Mexicans and others who live in oppressed nations.

BT: What conditions do you see as favorable for developing struggle in the South?

CL: In the North, our people are suffering from severe economic hardship. Many people are now beginning to retreat to the South. Many companies are also retreating to the South in order to reexploit old markets. They go to the South to cut their labor costs, into states which don't have strong labor unions, where the cost of living is supposed to be lower and where you can get away with paying less money. And so the youth of our population is going to the South, because these are the jobs which are available to people who don't want to work for the police and who don't want to sell drugs.

And as they go there it's setting up for an economic clash. Many Blacks are not acclimated to working for the lowest amount that they could possibly get and are not going to be patient with that—especially the youth population. It's going to cost more and more to live and you're getting less and less, and so subjectively it sets up for a level of disenchantment amongst the Black population as they see their relative position to white people being so grossly disproportionate. We think that you are creating in the South now a potential revolutionary work force. Perhaps more revolutionary than any we've seen to this point and with a certain desperation involved here too, as the industrial base dwindles and the question of genocide becomes a reality.

The New Afrikan Independence Movement claims the five states of South Carolina, Georgia, Mississippi, Alabama, and Louisiana as their national territory. Despite their dispersion throughout the U.S., Black people still constitute a majority in many areas of the Black Belt.



And so if we don't take control of this situation, where we're bounced from neighborhood to neighborhood, from place to place, from geographical district to geographical district, hoping that this job lasts and treats us in a certain way, there's the possibility that we're not going to be around long as a people—certainly not in any kind of mentally fit condition as a people. And as we see drugs eat our people up, I think that all those struggles against all those evils are going to lead to one conclusion—that we have to take hold. And I think that conclusion is going to be supported by a revolutionary work force, which is being developed in the South. And I think that we can convince that work force to struggle for Black independence.

BT: *What is the importance of the South as a land base for the struggle and how does this objective relate to Black communities in other parts of the country?*

CL: We have in the South a geographical area where fairly large stretches of contiguous land have large numbers of Black people on them. If Afrikan people in America are trying to centralize the struggle, then you have to look centrally to a land base where it's possible to do so and that's where we think it is.

But it is not only limited to the South. We think that we can get support for that centrally located struggle from

bases around the country, from our scattered colony. And we have seen in the struggle in the cities that there is a lot we can do to disrupt the empire if the empire resists our right to self-determination. Once people in the cities have a central focus on a goal which seems to promise some permanent results—as opposed to just getting an official elected who will be corrupted or ineffective in the next two years—then we think we can get support. And we think national liberation is that kind of solution.

Finally by struggling for national independence we give the clandestine movement, the Black Liberation Army and others, something really to fight for, as opposed to fighting for liberation in the abstract. We give it a land base, which most armies in the world need. We give it some specific objectives to achieve even if they're not struggling on the land base, even if their work is done in Detroit or New York or Philadelphia, or wherever it might have to be done in order to help immobilize the empire and to engage the people in a struggle which helps to raise the people's consciousness as the public movement advances.

The central element to all this is: if Black people decide that they will not be controlled by the United States of America, that they will be free and independent, can it be stopped? It's not a question of "Can we achieve it?" But it's a question of "Can they stop us?" And I think that once we make that decision, they cannot stop us. □



photo credit: Cathy Cade

*Rozzie
and Harriet
Raise a Family*

Lesbian Mothers

by Judy Gerber with Leslie Mullin

My two year old daughter is sick. She has a miserable flu and as I set up the bag for dirty tissues next to her bed, I tell her this is what my mother used to do for me. It's not the first time I've referred to my mother, but this time she looks at me with concern and asks if it's true I only had one mother. My daughter and I live with her birth mother (my partner) and two other lesbians. This is our family. It doesn't look like other families. We have no interest in finding anything like that. It certainly differs a lot from the model we were raised with in America, where the white nuclear family is a sacred institution.

There's much to be said about lesbian families these days. We are having children in every possible combination imaginable—alone, co-parenting with a partner, with several good friends, with a gay man. The lesbian baby boom is forcing us to confront questions like: What can parenting teach us about furthering a struggle for lesbian liberation? Will lesbian families challenge the deeply entrenched, rigid gender/sex system within our society? Can we raise children in a way that helps them reject all of society's garbage about sex?

For lesbians, the "ideal" family has always been a sharp thorn in our sides. It doesn't exist for us, our lovers, our community or our children. We reject its very premise by asserting that women are whole people, whether we are attached to men or not; whether we are mothers or not. Choosing not to have children doesn't make us any less a woman. And because lesbians aren't attached to men, the families we create—with and without kids—are ignored or despised.

For Black and Latina lesbians, racism is a fundamental condition dominating the circumstances of their lives, and those of their children. Raising children to survive and resist a white supremacist society determines priorities different from those of white lesbians fighting the sanctity of the nuclear family. In racist America, where white kids' lives are presumed to be more important than Third World kids', Third World women face a constant battle to keep family together. While I hope this article speaks to the experiences of many lesbian mothers, my own reality as a white lesbian has doubtless shaped many of my perceptions. It's important to acknowledge that these differences shape different priorities among us.

My partner and I are raising our children collectively. Because we are lesbian anti-imperialists, we hope to give them a different set of values than those we got. For us, this means the way they look at men and women; but also, the way they look at the world. It's important to us that they grow up anti-racist. We want them to understand that many of the problems people face in this

country are not their individual problems, but the result of an oppressive society. We want them to care about other people and be able to see themselves in the position of someone being oppressed, to understand how it must feel.

For the last fifteen years, we have struggled over our views of nuclear families because we understand that under capitalism wives and children are the property of men. We have fought for men to take responsibility for children. We've tried to acknowledge and involve our community in bringing up our kids. We've come to understand the importance of our children's relationships with adults and children outside the boundaries of our family.

Having children makes lesbian identity more of an issue. New conflicts emerge with every institution we encounter. When we become parents, it sinks in to our parents that lesbianism is not "just a stage" to be outgrown. These choices are serious and they shake people up. Some parents give up a relationship to their grandchildren rather than accept our lesbian families. Bosses refuse to acknowledge we are pregnant.

We face other obstacles, from the mundane to the tragic. Every form we fill out has a space for the child's "mother" and "father." Lesbians who have lived together years longer than a married couple can't get employment benefits for each other. In the event of a serious illness or death, our partner's legal family steps in and we have no recourse.

WHAT SOCIAL PRESSURE CAN'T ENFORCE, THE STATE WILL

Some lesbians who had children through straight relationships live in constant fear of losing them if their ex-husband finds out they are lesbians. Courts have even changed custody when fathers challenge a mother's fitness on the basis of her lesbianism. Often this happens when a man remarries and has a new wife to take care of the kids. In a study done by Phyllis Chesler, 88% of lesbian mothers who faced custody battles lost their children in the courts.¹ Many women remain closeted in the hope that custody will never become an issue. Courts can impose conditions forcing mothers to choose between their lovers/lesbian friends and their kids. The state has taken children away from lesbian rights activists and from women who are dependent on the government—in prison, on welfare, etc.

Lesbians who have children by donor insemination are also threatened by custody challenges. Courts don't consider us fit mothers; donors have won joint custody of children born of their sperm.

Nowhere in this country does a non-biological mother have the same legal rights as a birth mother.² Dealing with a medical emergency can be blocked if a non-biological mother takes a child to the hospital—the hospital can deny care. If something happens to the birth mother—prison, death, serious disability—then who has custody rights?

In a recent Florida case³, two women who had been together for 11 years were raising a child who was already six years old. The birth mother died, and the grandparents sued the surviving mother for custody. At the trial, experts testified that it would be devastating for the child to face the loss of a second parent and then, before adulthood, surely have her elderly grandparents die. The courts ruled in favor of the grandparents even though they were in their 70s and lived in a retirement home that didn't allow children.

Lesbian families by their very nature are not the traditional nuclear family. Claiming the right to have family at all is a form of resistance. But by itself this is not enough. The consciousness with which we build our families will determine our relationship to this society.

The re-birth of feminism in the 60s challenged the view that women's primary role in the world is that of wife and mother. We fought for women's right to choose not to be with men and not to have children. But developing family is human. I don't think we understood this too well in the early days of the women's movement. In the late 60s, some feminists said that children were oppressive to women. And because the movement dismissed children as their mothers' problem and didn't support mothers, it seemed that way. Some women were forced to choose between isolation with children and giving them up for the movement.

Every so often articles still appear in the women's press complaining that all these lesbians having kids are just giving in to social pressure. But the reality is women do have children. They're a part of life. Children aren't the problem. The point is that sliding into the traditional role of motherhood would mean giving up everything we've learned about women's potential. Our solution has to be for all of us, with or without kids, to give mothers the necessary support to raise children and be political activists.

Ironically, we feel invisible as lesbian mothers. Raising children is such a common experience for women that some parts of being a lesbian mother are completely

¹ Phyllis Chesler, *Mothers On Trial - The Battle for Children and Custody*, Seal Press, 1986.

² The Lesbian Rights Project has just litigated the first adoption in California in which the birth mother did not have to give up her rights at the same time as the non-biological mother became a legal guardian.

³ Roberta Achtenberg, *Preserving and Protecting the Families of Lesbians and Gay Men*, Lesbian Rights Project, 1986.

normal, with a capital "N." At playgrounds, in grocery stores, at work or in our neighborhoods, we can talk about our children and be accepted by people who assume we're straight just because we're mothers. Yet there's something very disturbing about that acceptance. We're exploding the myth that we can't be mothers by saying, yes, we have the desire and right to be parents, but we don't intend to conform to society's definitions of motherhood. We want to be part of dismantling the hierarchy of gender and all the rigid categories of sexuality that dominate women in our society.

In a city like San Francisco, our lesbian families can be celebrated alongside the straight ones, if we fight for support and validation. But when we scratch the surface of that acceptance, we find most people hoping that our children turn out like everyone else. Is that what we want? I don't think so—not if we really want to transform society. We don't just want to join "motherhood" in greater numbers and ask the society to move over a little bit to make room for us. Yes, the more lesbian mothers there are, the easier it is for us all. But if we hate this culture, why make peace with it, when what we are

learning from our experiences with children can help us transform this society?


In some respects, living outside traditional, sanctioned families works to our benefit. We are forced to devise new forms of family. We can create whatever kinds are best for us. We've always been taught that the only correct way to raise children is with a mother and a father. Says who? Should we take as gospel the teachings of a society that does everything in its power to walk all over anyone that steps outside its socially defined norms?

The adult children of closed adoptions⁴ argue that lesbians who use anonymous sperm donors are denying their children's rights to both their parents. They say we are cheating our children. I disagree.

My daughter has loving parents. Why should some man who merely donated sperm be considered her father? When she asks, we'll teach her that her paternal genes come from a man who was nice enough to donate his

⁴ In closed adoptions, once the adoption is complete, the children are by law never to find out the identity of their biological parents.





credit: Cathy Cade

sperm. There are many kinds of families and lots of kids without fathers. We intend to raise our daughter with a view that it's positive she is growing up with lots of moms.

AND WHAT ABOUT THE CHILDREN?

Numerous studies comparing children of lesbians and gay men to children of heterosexuals have concluded that our children turn out just as "normal" as other children; that is, the same proportion will be straight as gay. Lesbians have found these studies helpful in child custody suits, even if they don't really reflect how we want to raise our children. As we reject gender/sex roles in society, our children will have more space to explore their own identities. Breaking out of sex roles—a struggle so many

lesbians and gay men have gone through—increases our sensitivity to our children facing similar pressures. Nothing will ever change if we don't give them the support to be different. It's part of how movements are built.

In my lesbian/gay history class, several lesbians and gays were upset because I proposed that the more our movement creates space for gays, the more of us there will be. When I talked about raising children so they have many sexual options, people were concerned, since straight society's worst fear is that we'll "get" their children. But if we believe that the goal of gay liberation goes beyond civil rights, that our movement can free up human possibilities for all people, then we have to start somewhere. How many of us could say with certainty we would be "out" today, if it wasn't for the opening created by the women's movement?

This means confronting some of our own fears about being gay in a homophobic society. It means trying to understand how deeply issues of gender identification are rooted in all of us. Lesbians are in a good position to question and challenge these assumptions together. Understanding them will help us develop models and behavior that open up the world of sexuality and choices to our children in ways we weren't allowed. But as "they" are always reminding us, we live in the real world—and so do our kids. We know the pain we've gone through and we want to spare our children some of it. We don't want to control them, but, like all parents, we have our ideas about how we want them to be.

These questions come up around what our kids look like, what they wear, what they read, what they watch on TV. When they're young, it's obvious that our concerns are more about our feelings than theirs. For instance, a friend of mine with a newborn son received a lot of pink, "feminine" baby clothes. She kept a few, but passed most of them on to another friend who just had a girl. She knew it wouldn't hurt the kid to be dressed in pink, yet somehow it felt strange and why not pass it on? Still another mother wouldn't keep any pink clothes for her little girl; she's just too turned off by the whole idea.

Examples abound. The little girl who looks totally tough but, much to her parents' chagrin, insists on wearing pink. The little boy who wants to wear what his mother considers too "femme" clothes to school. The boy who is into G.I. Joe; the girl who will only wear dresses.

These seem like rather trivial concerns. But they reveal our own insecurities and values which we in turn transfer to our kids. Even lesbians, though we pride ourselves on having rejected sex roles, have to contend with internal-

ized gender definitions, however they manifest.

Should we suppress boys who appear too feminine because they might get teased—and who in some strange way may push some of our own buttons? Should we feel hurt and protective of our girls when everyone calls them “he?” Although the pressures to conform to “girlhood” are very strong, it’s easier and more acceptable for girls to be tomboys. Boys’ parameters are more restricted. For them, appearing feminine (the boundaries of which change with the fashions) is the worst.

But if we don’t let them wear what they want, aren’t we unconsciously censoring other cross-gender behavior? And what if they’re into things we abhor? The answer has to include letting them fully explore their own sexuality and identity, while struggling with them over mores we don’t agree with. Understanding ourselves will make this a lot more possible. When we don’t challenge our own responses, we recreate the same problems all over again.

All this says nothing about how feminine, masculine or androgynous our children will turn out. But however they develop, let’s give them as positive a view of their possibilities as we can. They see women playing all kinds of roles. It is one of the most important things lesbians can offer children. When we aren’t concerned with conforming to narrow sex-prescribed roles, when we do “male” things and “female” things, we show the children that all people are capable of doing everything. We don’t have to be one way or the other. If one week we decide to be completely domestic, cooking up a storm, cleaning the

house from top to bottom and the next week we’re out changing the oil in the car or leading a demonstration or doing any number of things considered traditionally “male,” we establish what the possibilities are for them. If we do it right, we can have some impact on a son’s ability to respect women when he grows up. We can give our daughters examples—not just words—that things can be different for them too.

We worry about the impact of gay oppression on our children. My daughter went to a local progressive community center for a children’s concert put on by a feminist group (that includes lesbians). Yet every song referred to a mommy and a daddy for every family situation. We were lucky on this one, because all it took to change the content was pointing it out to the performers. At her childcare center, they respect us as her co-parents, even referring to me as mom. But is the lesbian model included when they present different types of families to the children? I doubt it. These concerns are important for our children. They too need the support of their peers. The more we can build a movement addressing these questions, the more space will be created in the world for our children to grow in.

LOTS OF MOMS: BREAKING NEW GROUND

Lesbian parenting creates a whole new set of relations with no role models for us. We’re breaking new ground. Unlike heterosexual couples, power dynamics within les-



Sour Cream, Sheba Feminist Publishers

bian relationships are not determined by gender. Yet, for lesbians who decide to co-parent from a child's birth, the struggles start immediately. Non-biological mothers are a non-entity in this society. Even before the baby is born, the pregnant woman is getting all the validation, while the non-biological mom is having to fight for the most basic recognition. In a social scene, do friends ask her how it feels to become a mother? At work, how do you explain that you are becoming a mother when you show no physical signs? Your choices are to be up front about it or concoct a story about adopting a child.


Co-parenting takes a deep commitment on the birth mother's part in particular. She has a distinct social advantage (if it can be called that) over non-biological moms. People who choose to ignore the fact that she is a lesbian will still deal with her as a mother. But two mothers? That forces the issue. The laws, family, schools, hospitals, employers, social services, the IRS—none of them recognizes us both as parents. Our frustration sometimes turns inward and we argue about circumstances neither one of us controls. A co-parent who has to do all the fighting for recognition herself will feel completely isolated. It matters that with family, schools, doctors, etc., my partner insists people deal with both of us. We have shared the responsibility of asserting that we are lesbian mothers.

There are other kinds of issues. Before my daughter was born, I worried about how she was going to know I was her mother. For instance, there is such a mystique about breast feeding and "bonding" with an infant, but only the biological mother can do that. Does she give up some of her feedings so the other mother can bottle feed? How long should breast feeding continue? My partner and I agreed when to stop because of my concerns that the physical bond of nursing would create an imbalance in our relationship to our daughter. This kind of thing has so little impact on the child, but makes a big difference to the adults. While all parents have conflicts over role expectations, two mothers' conflicts are over the *same* role expectations. A father may feel jealous of a nursing mother and baby; but he is unlikely to feel his fatherhood threatened by it, since breastfeeding is, by definition, not a "father" behavior.

Twenty years ago, a lesbian mother and her lover could live with the mother's children for years and not consider themselves "co-parents." If they split up, they assumed the birth mother kept the kids. Today we approach these relationships differently. Many great mothers aren't biological ones. As we explore new choices, our confidence that we can build new kinds of families grows. We look within ourselves and to our community for validation and change. □

*We're exploding
the myth that we
can't be mothers,
but we don't
intend to conform
to society's
definitions.*

Photos by Cathy Cade. Her book of photographs, *A Lesbian Photo Album—The Lives of Seven Lesbian Feminists*, is available from Waterwomen Books, 3022 Ashbrook Ct., Oakland, CA 94601.



Revising the Sixties

The Sixties: Years of Hope, Days of Rage

By Todd Gitlin

512 p. New York

Bantam

Reviewed by Robert Roth and Nancy Kurshan

Just when we thought the 60s were forgotten, along came 1988. Now, amidst a spate of 20 year reunions and nostalgia, a new wave of memorabilia has descended upon us, much of it comforting and unthreatening.

Todd Gitlin's book, *The Sixties*, has been widely reviewed and publicized, in part because of Gitlin's credentials as a former National Secretary of Students for a

Democratic Society. Now a Professor at the University of California, Berkeley, Gitlin was *there* for many of the significant moments of the decade—Chicago in 1968, People's Park, the first SDS demonstration against the war in Vietnam, smoking marijuana and listening to Bob Dylan. And it appears he was taking notes the entire time. Gitlin is a good writer, whose book often reads like a well-paced novel, packed with fascinating characters, inside info, and more than its share of excitement. Unfortunately, it's also an argument against the revolutionary politics which came to distinguish the 60s.

Gitlin has really written two books. The first covers the early history of the New Left—the New Left he loved and helped lead. There's some valuable material here: the



origins of the cultural rebellion of the 60s, the formative days of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC), the writing of the Port Huron Statement (the original SDS manifesto). There's the inside story of how SDS refused to yield to pressure from social democrats like Irving Howe and Michael Harrington, who wanted to make anti-communism a principle of the new student organization. And there's much insight into the seamy side of American liberalism.

Take, for example, Gitlin's account of the Democrats' betrayal of the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party (MFDP) at the Atlantic City Convention in 1964. In the name of "unifying the party" and holding onto Southern white support, the Democrats refused to seat the grassroots Black delegates and instead sanctioned the racist white delegates, whose elections were based on systematic denial of voting rights for Blacks. The liberals did the dirty work, led by Hubert Humphrey, who blocked MFDP leader Fannie Lou Hamer from even addressing the delegates, saying "there's no way we'll let that illiterate woman speak on the floor of our Convention." Humphrey was rewarded with the Vice Presidential nomination, and the student and civil rights movements received an unforgettable lesson in Democratic Party opportunism.



Overleaf: Flag of National Liberation Front of Vietnam flies at Washington Monument, May Day, 1971.

So far, so good. But it's in Part Two—the New Left's move towards revolutionary politics—that Gitlin frames his conclusions. Unable to accept the strategic viewpoint of radicals within the New Left, he takes pot shots at people's psyches. Everyone was either playing at revolution, massaging their egos, assuaging their white guilt or expressing their rage. He quotes Berkeley Free Speech Movement leader Mario Savio's famous words: "There is a time when the operation of the machine becomes so odious, makes you so sick at heart...that you've got to put your bodies upon the gears and upon the wheels..." and calls them a "rationale for self-crucifixion by a young man raised in a Catholic home." From his

point of view, everything went too far. If only people could have just smoked marijuana and not dropped acid. If only civil disobedience had remained tame. If only Blacks hadn't pushed for Black Power. If only the feminist movement hadn't hurt the feelings of so many men. If only we all could have been more moderate and mature.

Gitlin paints a picture of growing isolation as the New Left moved left:

A too-uncomplicated endorsement of Third World revolutions—and revolutionary organizations—built a fire-break around the New Left part of the antiwar movement, sealing it off from the underbrush sympathy of the unconvinced. Surely those NLF flags were part of the explanation for one of the stunning political facts of the decade: that as the war steadily lost popularity in the late Sixties, so did the antiwar movement...

This premise is questionable at best. What Gitlin sees as a "loss of popularity" was, in fact, an inevitable part

of the process of polarization. Looking back, many people forget how controversial it was to oppose the war. This was true long before NLF flags flew in antiwar demos. The first conscientious objectors were called cowards. The first draft card burners were attacked by angry mobs. The first GI organizers were denounced as traitors. The first student protestors were reviled as communist dupes. In the face of such opposition, some organizers cautioned that militant action would alienate people and isolate the movement. But many activists knew that stopping the war meant confrontation, not just simple protest...and that we had to be willing to sharply divide the country in order to have an impact.

This meant taking risks at each stage—breaking with the Democrats, demanding immediate withdrawal rather than negotiations, defending the Vietnamese, disrupting the warmakers. The movement's audacity helped create a crisis of conscience throughout the country. As Trilateral Commission analyst Samuel Huntington was to remark years later, whole sectors of the population became activated and "ungovernable," and the social cost of the war became higher than what the rulers bargained for.

Still, what about those NLF flags? As the war went on, more of us broke with anti-communism and began to identify with the Cuban Revolution and the National Liberation Front in Vietnam. No friend of either Vietnam or Cuba, Gitlin attacks what he considers the New Left's "romanticism" of Third World struggles. But this was really a coming-of-age for the movement. People were beginning to see through the U.S. lies about the "enemy."


And we were beginning to see that a victory for the people of Vietnam was our victory as well. Each delegation to Vietnam or Cuba was condemned by the media and each NLF flag was highlighted on the evening news as proof of disloyalty. But the movement continued to grow, and the solidarity that developed between the antiwar movement and the Vietnamese kept thousands active even after U.S. troops were removed. It also helped pave the way for the broad-based solidarity that exists today with the people of Nicaragua and El Salvador.

Yes, there was a backlash. The reaction was skillfully orchestrated by the government and media. Nixon and Agnew were able to mobilize support among large numbers of whites who were terrified of Black Power, furious at the protests and thoroughly trained to stand with their

country "right or wrong." But the power and militancy of the resistance was a factor in helping force even Nixon to finally acknowledge defeat in Vietnam. Despite the backlash, the New Left was able to mobilize and hold on to a huge and active base—reaching from college campuses into the armed forces and other sectors of white working class youth.

The Black freedom struggle was the other great radicalizing influence on the New Left. Gitlin's own roots are in the Civil Rights Movement, the early struggles against desegregation, the partnership between young white students and Black organizers in the Mississippi Freedom Summer of 1964. But, by 1965, the Black movement was taking a different turn. In 1966, the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC), which was the largest and most dynamic force in the Civil Rights Movement, articulated the concept of Black Power, fired its white staff and urged white people to organize an anti-racist movement in our own communities. The SNCC statement explaining this move read in part:

How does the white radical view the Black community and how does he view the poor white community, in terms of organizing? So far, we have found that most white radicals have sought to escape the horrible reality of America by going into the Black community and attempting to organize Black people while neglecting the organization of their own people's racist communities. How can one clean up



*I'm Already
Drafted In
**THE BLACK
LIBERATION
ARMY***

someone else's back yard when one's own yard is untidy? It is very ironic and curious that aware whites in this country can champion anti-colonialism in other countries in Africa, Asia and Latin America, but when Black people move toward similar goals of self-determination in this country they are viewed as racists and anti-white by these same progressive whites.

Many whites had worked side-by-side with Black or-

here at home.

This is the war which Gitlin finds hardest to deal with. He thinks that Black nationalism "derailed" the movement, and he never acknowledges its deep impact on Black people or the New Left. There is zero mention of any Black nationalist organizations beyond the Panthers. And the Panthers themselves are characterized as a "revolutionary gang," their white allies dismissed as guilt-rid-



credit: Robert Lebeck/Black Star

Pentagon, 1967. Demonstrators charged past cordons of soldiers and burned draft cards.

ganizers within the Black community. Now Blacks were telling us to leave, to work among other whites, to respect their own right to lead and define their movement. And the process wasn't polite. In addition, sectors of the Black movement, along with Puerto Ricans, Chicano/Mexicanos and Native Americans, were also beginning to raise a revolutionary critique of the system, far more comprehensive than that projected by the New Left. White radicals were challenged to see that colonialism existed right here at home, that occupying armies patrolled the streets of the Black and Latino communities, that the entire concept of American democracy was a myth.

Black revolutionary organizations like the Black Panther Party, the Revolutionary Action Movement, the League of Revolutionary Black Workers and the Republic of New Afrika (RNA) grew stronger. Black GIs were spearheading rebellion in the armed forces. Urban Black rebellions were commonplace, and Black revolutionaries were talking about the need for a Black Liberation Army. The issues facing the New Left now included armed struggle taking place in *this* country. It was one thing to oppose a war 3,000 miles away. It was something else again to take part in a war that seemed to be beginning

den, fawning and romantic. This is all very convenient. What's never addressed is our failure in the white antiwar movement to mobilize in defense of a Black struggle facing severe state repression. Because of this blindspot, Gitlin is unable to explain the motive factors behind SDS's 1969 split—where a cutting edge issue was how to respond to the government assault on the Panthers.

The New Left was every bit as male supremacist as people say it was. Gitlin understands this. For any male leader of the movement, it would be hard not to, especially after 20 years of criticism. But he reduces the issue of sexism to a fight within the movement, rather than drawing out the enormous implications for the whole society of women's liberation. And he's as concerned with "excesses" among the women as he is with male supremacy. He likes his movements polite.

It's not hard to see why it wasn't. After all, this was a movement which said to draft resisters: "Girls Say Yes to Boys Who Say No," and where many men really did think that women should be "seen and not heard." Women who formed the backbone of both civil rights and antiwar or-

ganizations were more often than not expected to do just that—be the backbone! Be the typists, the office organizers, the workers and the helpmates. And, given the sexual revolution, they were expected to be the bedmates as well! The women who could hold their own in the midst of all this were considered, and were encouraged to consider themselves, exceptional.

What exposed all this was the emergence of an independent women's movement. By 1970, there were hundreds of consciousness-raising groups springing up around the country. A battle exploded both within and outside the New Left, where women demanded equality and the right to lead. Lesbians and gay men came out of the closet en masse and further shook up the status quo. Male egos were bruised all across the country. Women were discovering that their feelings of inadequacy and anger were shared, the result of women's oppression, and that there was an answer to this—women's liberation and an autonomous women's movement.

Looking back, it's easy to see the many mistakes of the New Left. We were a very immature movement. We thought that revolution was around the corner, and we were woefully unprepared for the repression that the system had in store. We were too often sectarian and disdained potentially important alliances. Coming mainly from the white middle class, we were never sure how "authentic" our movement really was and we groped in the dark for a clearer definition of our base. Faced with the urgency of building cadre organizations and armed resistance, revolutionaries within SDS ended up sacrificing SDS itself. All this made it easier for the state to eventually marginalize the radical wing of the movement.

Yet, if we leave it at that, the achievements of the decade are lost. Like student and youth movements around the world, the New Left reached the conclusion that revolutionary struggle was both legitimate and necessary even here in the "land of the free." We rejected liberalism as we realized that the Vietnam War was not just a mistaken foreign policy, but the purest expression of the U.S. defense of empire. Many people broke with white supremacy and understood for the first time the strategic role of the Black Liberation Movement. The women's movement emerged as a powerful social force. The movement reached deeply into society, affecting everyone. There were thousands of acts of sabotage and armed resistance. Clandestine groups like the Weather Underground were protected and supported by a large mass base. A highly effective, multi-levelled resistance was built, one which challenged

American racism and helped end the Vietnam War.

Twenty years later, it's fashionable to laud the 60s while condemning the revolutionary currents of the period. Perhaps this is what makes books like *The Sixties* so acceptable. Jeff Greenfield, the *Nightline* commentator, has called it the "benchmark against which all future accounts of 'the movement' will be measured." Yet there are plenty of other accounts—old and new—far more interesting and provocative than Gitlin's. To name a few: *The Making of Black Revolutionaries* by James Forman, *The Sixties Papers* (edited by Stew Albert and Judy Clavir), *SDS* by Kirkpatrick Sale and *The Imagination of the New Left* by George Katsiafikas. So why is Gitlin getting all the reviews? Just as the teachings of Malcolm X have been buried, and Martin Luther King's strategy of militant confrontation has been conveniently forgotten, so too the history of the New Left is now undergoing slow and subtle revision. Gitlin's book is, indeed, a benchmark in that process. □





THE U.S. ECONOMIC DECLINE

Julio Rosado,
Movimiento de Liberación
Nacional Puertorriqueño (MLN)

On "Black Monday" of October 1987, the stock market melted down, falling 500 points in a day and suddenly the economy was front page news. Analysts blamed everything from computer trading to yuppie greed. But most economists pointed to high level of public and private debt and the flood of Asian imports that far exceed U.S. exports. While the stock market recovered some of its losses since October, it has remained shaky. And other warning signs are everywhere: bank failures, corporate takeovers, stock market scandals.

In 1988 the dollar has fallen to about half its 1985 value against the Japanese Yen and the German Mark. A shift of a percentage point or two in the balance of trade or payments each month is enough to send the Dow Jones skyrocketing or plummeting. Most of the remedies proposed in Congress or by the presidential candidates tend

to focus on how unfair the Japanese are to the U.S. and how we need to stop being Mr. Nice Guy and make the rest of the world play by the rules. Military/corporate leaders like Admiral Bobby Inman and others suggest that we shift the burden of military spending onto Japan and NATO. At the same time, the Treasury continues to hope that making the dollar cheaper in comparison to foreign currencies will solve our economic woes.

To understand the solutions being proposed and if they have a chance of working, we have to understand the problem. Is the U.S. economy fundamentally strong—as the "leading economic indicators" claim—and just the victim of unscrupulous foreigners? Or is there a real economic crisis behind all the signs of disarray? If so, where is it, where did it come from and where is it going?

In early 1988, the Breakthrough editorial collective

asked Julio Rosado of the Movimiento de Liberación Nacional Puertorriqueño (MLN), a public revolutionary organization of Puerto Ricans in the U.S., to present his analysis of the situation. The following article is an edited version of that presentation. In it, he outlines how elements of this crisis—particularly a shrinking industrial base and a growing negative balance of trade—have their roots in the political and economic decisions of the victorious U.S. in the post-World War II period. The "American Century" unleashed a set of contradictions—in terms of the domestic economy, the relationship to the Third World, and the U.S. partnership/competition with Europe and Japan—which underlie its present problems. In our next issue, we hope to have an analysis of these contradictions as they are being played out and struggled over today.

"THE AMERICAN CENTURY"

The roots of the present U.S. economic crisis can be found in the post-Second World War situation in 1945. The U.S. held about 70 percent of the total wealth that was available for investment in the world. Great Britain, France, Japan, and Germany were exhausted, essentially non-functional economies. The United States, on the other hand, finished the war with an enormous productive capacity, oriented toward war production and in need of retooling for industrial production. However, they faced the problem of who they could sell their product to. The Soviet Union and the developing Soviet bloc were essentially out of the question for political reasons. The Third World was still colonial possessions owned and exploited by the French and British. The rumblings of national liberation struggles were just beginning to be heard.

The United States needed, therefore, to organize the Asian and European markets for the consumption of America's highly sophisticated industrial and technological products. The Marshall Plan¹ was organized for this purpose and was the first phase of investments of American excess capital, which itself had been the result of the accumulation of wealth in the course of WWII.

The United States was now the hegemonic power on a global scale. But immediately one of the major challenges that arose was the struggle for independence in Africa and

Asia. Some former colonies, like India, had been active for a long time in the quest for national liberation; others, like Kenya or Vietnam, had just begun the struggle in the post-war period, and were now beginning to develop very rapidly. British capital developed an approach, followed to some extent by the French, of salvaging their influence in these countries by acceding to independence under puppet regimes. Rather than involving themselves in long drawn-out struggles, they began to cede power wherever they had civil service structures which were loyal and known. (In places like Kenya with Kenyatta it was more difficult, because the leading elements were not civil service elements, but rather radical nationalist elements who presented a high level of uncertainty for British manipulations.)²

The United States saw that it would replace British and French interests on a global scale. The ideological elements of this American global reorganization were both to emphasize American support for nationalist causes, and also to condemn communist movements. The OSS, the forerunner of the CIA, became very involved in separating out communist insurgencies from nationalist insurgencies, and blocking communist influence in the national liberation struggles.

The U.S. saw the latter part of the 20th century as the "American Century" to run from 1945 to 2045 and to provide the framework for the 1000 year millennial empire! This required replacing European and Asian imperialism with military and economic blocs which would be dependent on the United States. NATO³, the

² The British had strenuously resisted the Indian struggle for independence. The high political and economic costs of that experience taught a clear lesson. Between 1945 and 1976, 17 former British colonies in Africa alone achieved nominal independence. Only in the white settler states of Kenya (1963) and later Zimbabwe (1980) were there prolonged armed struggles. The French, with the notable exceptions of Vietnam and Algeria, took much the same tack, ceding independence to 19 of its 20 African colonies.

³ NATO was established in 1949 by the Treaty of Paris, creating a pact of "mutual defense" led by the U.S. It organized 10 anti-communist European governments and Canada against the Soviet Union and its allies. West Germany joined in 1953, completing the military force on the Soviet Union's western flank. Under its terms, the U.S. stationed about 300,000 troops in Europe and supplied a huge percentage of the heavy weaponry, at the cost of hundreds of billions of dollars.

NATO was the model for SEATO, established in 1954. However, SEATO was never very strong. It ended up as an alliance of the United States, the colonial powers Britain and France; the white settler states of Australia and New Zealand; and Thailand, Pakistan and the Philippines.

¹ The U.S. gave or lent Europe (including West Germany) and Japan \$17 billion between 1947 and 1955. The Marshall Plan allowed the U.S. to direct postwar economic rebuilding along capitalist lines (as opposed to more socialist directions), to repress left-wing trade unions and political parties, and to expand foreign investment by U.S.-based multinationals. U.S. foreign investment grew from \$7 billion in 1946 to \$32 billion by 1960.

North Atlantic Treaty Organization, along with the South East Asian Treaty Organization (SEATO), became the cornerstones of American military hegemony. Japan on one side and western Europe on the other side would be the two cornerstones of this political and economic hegemony.

These blocs would be totally dependent on the U.S.—not only militarily, but also economically, serving as centers for the global distribution of American products. The United States was not particularly concerned about the formal independence of the former British and French colonies as long as they had access to the markets through the commonwealth systems that both France and Britain developed.

These blocs also functioned to contain socialism with a *cordon sanitaire* to encircle the Soviet Union and later China with a ring of pro-western colonies or nationalist republics that would fit into the framework of this new economic imperialism. This would keep the socialist countries on the defensive—politically, militarily, and economically—and would prevent them from spreading their influence and ideology in the Third World. Also, their military and economic capabilities would be severely constrained by their inability to penetrate the global market place. This was one of the reasons why the U.S. kept the socialist countries out of the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, and the international economic and banking agreements.⁴

THE EUROPEAN VIEW: THE ROAD TO REASSERTION

At the same time, the European powers maintained their own vision of their survival and economic development. This is the period of the reorganization of the European political strategy. The first element of this was centered on maintaining European economic hegemony by building up a commonwealth system—the British by its Commonwealth of Nations, and France likewise with the overseas departments and the economic community of French speaking nations.

Secondly, Europe encouraged the building of NATO,

not just as a defense structure, but even more to establish the economic limits of European military involvement. This is very crucial. Europe could not rearm in the same manner as in previous epochs. They could no longer afford to field huge standing armies. They were no longer in a position to develop the kind of rivalries which had marked the entire period of industrialization, beginning with the industrial revolution in Great Britain. So, they began to play up to the American strategy, understanding full well that this meant the establishment of U.S. political and economic hegemony, and the countering of socialist influence in the world. The British and Europeans encouraged U.S. investment in the recovery of Europe. By accepting American military supremacy, they were able to underwrite their own military establishments without laying out enormous amounts of funds.

Finally, initial steps were taken towards European economic integration as a means of developing Europe economically and politically as a rival of both the U.S. and the Soviet bloc. The early steps were taken immediately after WWII. In 1948 the first discussions on the creation of a European parliament began, including discussion about setting aside European rivalries and developing European cooperation. In 1950 the first European economic planning began to take shape.⁵

This then was the European strategy *vis à vis* the United States: to use the American preoccupations with so-called Soviet expansionism and to transform these into assets for European political and economic development. The U.S. saw only the strengths that would establish its global hegemony. On the other hand, the Japanese and Europeans analyzed what U.S. hegemony meant, and how they could use it to develop themselves and allow their bourgeoisies to recover full power and economic capability.


THE CONTRADICTIONS RIPEN: THE THIRD WORLD TAKES SHAPE

Between 1950 and 1962 another set of dynamics begins to emerge. First and foremost is the emergence of national liberation struggles. In the most economically important countries of the Third World, revolution presages not just a formal break with colonialism, but also the establishment of governments whose primary mission is the building up of their countries—not the building up of individual fortunes. That is why there are periods of revolutions

⁴ These structures were established at the Bretton Woods Conference of August 1945. At this meeting the dollar was established as the world currency, and the rates at which the major currencies of Europe and Japan would trade against the dollar were fixed. (These rates kept the price of U.S. goods artificially low and therefore more competitive.) The International Monetary Fund (IMF) was created to control the international balance of payments by placing conditions on short-term loans to countries with a payments deficit, and the World Bank was set up as an agency to lend dollars to Third World countries.

⁵ The most important institution of European integration is the European Economic Community (EEC) the "Common Market" established in 1957. The EEC includes the United Kingdom, France, West Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Belgium, Luxemburg, Ireland, and Greece. EEC members have abolished most trade barriers and accept each other's currencies.

Importing more... ...and exporting less



within the revolutions, where the old civil servants are being thrown out and are being replaced by nationalist leaders who envision the total development of the country, rather than the development of particular sectors.

Kenya, Algeria, the Indo-Chinese war against the French, Nkrumah in Ghana, Nasserism in Egypt—the leading feature of these national liberation struggles is the ideology of nationalization—the assumption of total control of national resources, and the demand for market price adequate for the purpose of financing national industrialization and development. To what heretofore appeared to be fundamentally a contradiction between capitalism and socialism, we now add a third element, the contradiction between capitalism and radical nationalism.

One of the indications of the potential of this sort of nationalism is the first steps towards the nationalization of critical natural resources. While this process does not shape up immediately as an important feature of the new economic situation, it slowly begins to change the relationship of the pricing of raw commodities, and imperceptibly begins to move the prices of raw materials higher; and gradually more countries begin to assume direct control of the movement of the raw materials of their own countries.

Eventually, this process will lead to the formation of cartels, like OPEC and the coffee cartel, to the North-South dialogue, and to the growing demand that access to the raw materials of the Third World be tied to the transfer

of advanced technology by the West. But in this period none of these things are seen, and it is almost an invisible and imperceptible movement that begins to emerge. Nevertheless it is a movement of incredible strategic importance which should not be underestimated.

The second important feature of this period is the developing competition by Europe and Japan in the market place, and the interplay which develops between the European, Japanese and North American capitalist structures. Europe attempts to play its commonwealth card in order to get preferential treatment in the developing countries. The U.S. begins to utilize aid and loans as weapons to counter the European inside track on the Third World. Japan begins to put in place a "war economy for industrial production" in order to intensify the quantity of Japanese products at a cheap price. The aim of this policy is to overcome the lack of either the capital investment capabilities of the U.S. or the commonwealth structures of the Europeans. This begins to generate a three-way rivalry between the capitalist centers.

A third feature of this period is the economic interpenetration of the capitalist countries.⁶ For the first time,

⁶ Between 1952 and 1967, U.S. exports doubled; those of the Common Market increased fourfold; and Japan's grew eightfold. In the same period, direct U.S. foreign investment (about half the capitalist world's total) went up about five times, from less than \$12 billion in 1950 to nearly \$60 billion by 1967.


Tanks or Toyotas

Between 1960 and 1980, Germany and Japan invested heavily in non-military productive capacity, while the U.S. poured money into the defense of its empire.


United States



Germany



Japan



Military Spending
as Percentage of GNP



Non-military Investment
as Percentage of GNP

European goods on a large scale begin to be sold in the U.S. and compete with American products. The penetration of markets is now an important factor to Europe and Japan as well as the U.S.

Nevertheless, the U.S. was on a binge; it was rolling; it was moving; it was powerful; it was capable; it was never-ending. And that sense of empire—the power of U.S. imperialism—prevented the U.S. from being able to analyze the consequences of all of these developments and see that inevitably they were going to cause an explosion.

THE 60'S: FIRST SYMPTOMS OF TROUBLE

The U.S. had already begun to undergo a decline as a result of the high cost of American labor and American products *vis a vis* cheap labor and the cheap cost of products from Europe and Japan. In part this was the result of a history of co-optation of the U.S. labor movement. Labor had become a significant power in economic terms and an integral element in the political process in the U.S. Rather than representing a class alternative, labor had become another estate in the consortium of estates that comprise the American system of political power.

Another sign of trouble in the 1960s was the decrease in the productive capacity of the United States. As a result of the interpenetration of markets, the United States had become globally conscious in a significant way. They began to see how productivity was very high in Asia, how goods could be made cheaper overseas. Along with the export of capital then, the economy began to experience the export of industrial production. Jobs began to leave the United States. This was the period of the dismantling of the manufacturing system in the U.S. and the exportation of the manufacturing system overseas.

Even while manufacturing began to leave the U.S., industrial production was still growing—in steel, construction, and other critical well-paying fields. Enough new jobs continued to be generated in the industrial sectors for the level of employment to be maintained in a reasonable way. So even though the share of manufacturing employment was shrinking, there continued to be an ability to absorb labor.



The oppressed nationalities within the U.S., on the other hand, were becoming increasingly marginalized. In 1945 there had been a boom in the employment of Blacks in the U.S. After the war, Blacks moved almost immediately into public employment and the service industries—the post office, city government, etc.⁷

Women left the labor force right after WWII. Initially, this caused no significant dislocations in the family structure, because males were capable of earning more than enough. But with the export of American manufacturing industry and the increasing competition from Europe and Japan, the earning capability of the male began to drop. Women began to move back into the market place.

⁷ The "non-white" (mostly Black) percentage of total government employment grew sharply from 5.6 percent in 1940 to 9.7 percent in 1956; then more slowly to 12.1 percent in 1962. This was made more important by the growth in public employment overall.

SYLVIA

by Nicole Hollander



VIETNAM: THE CHICKENS COME HOME TO ROOST

The seeds of contradiction which had been developing in the fifties and early sixties deepened into crisis with the U.S. war in Vietnam. This period was also marked by a new awareness of the crisis by the ruling circles.

The U.S. intervention in Vietnam was of strategic importance to capitalism. This military intervention was essentially aimed at beating back the onslaught of national liberation—not in either the narrower sense of a native class coming to power nor in the radical sense of control of national resources, but now in the ideological dimension of a new type of national liberation, which combined the passion of nationalism with the ideological direction of socialism.

It was critical that the liberation of Vietnam be stopped, that it not be allowed to succeed, because Vietnam presaged a global transformation in the value system of the developing countries. Its success would encourage similar developments elsewhere. Consequently, an all-out U.S. effort was made.

Of course the all-out effort comes with the sense of "mission" that accompanies American hegemony and the "American Century." In fact, the urgency was not there for Europe or Japan. France had settled out earlier. This would have been a complete settlement, but for the U.S. intervention in the peace process in Indochina, in which the U.S. won the southern part of Vietnam for their own particular strategic purposes. Neither Europe nor Japan were interested to the degree that the North Americans were. The view of their capitalist sectors was that they could deal with anybody. They were perfectly satisfied to

allow the U.S. to play out its sense of historic mission in Vietnam—rooting, of course, for them to win, but if not, it would not affect them in any fundamental way. Or so they believed.

The U.S. spent billions, not just for the war in South Vietnam, but for the internal pacification that accompanied that war—the War on Poverty. The War on Poverty was needed to secure its own internal powers against the assault by dissatisfied sectors of the society. The U.S. literally invested over \$100 billion dollars in direct and indirect expenses in these wars of pacification. The continuation of the war and the inability to keep pouring monies into the communities to bribe people into peace became very important economic factors.

The war in Vietnam and the accompanying war at home marked a major turning point in the economic situation of the U.S. and in the U.S.' overall leadership of empire. The policies of the U.S. administrations which followed the withdrawal from Vietnam represented the attempts to resolve what had been recognized by then as a crisis for the United States.

The U.S. finds itself in the current predicament because of its policy of hegemony immediately following the Second World War. Some economist pointed out a few years back that in a world in which the U.S. was the principal economic power, then any negative changes in the overall world economy necessarily meant that the U.S. would stand the most to lose. And that is simply the reality of the situation.

The strains will continue to be felt. The fact of the matter is that imperialism is in crisis; the capitalist structures are in serious trouble; and it appears that there's no possible cure. □

Dream Deferred, from page 6

finds no real parallel in white society. These conditions set the stage for a new round of battles for Black liberation.

THE DAYS OF OUTRAGE

Nowhere is this more evident than in New York, where a grassroots movement is taking to the streets against an onslaught of white supremacist violence which has earned the city the title: Racist Capital of the U.S.A. In the two years that have passed since the killing of Michael Griffith by a racist mob in Howard Beach, a wave of attacks by white citizens and police has brought tensions throughout the region close to the breaking point. In Upstate New York, Tawana Brawley, a 15-year-old Black youth was kidnapped and raped. Missing for four days, she was found with her body smeared with dog feces and the words "N---r" and "KKK" written on her skin. Tawana described her attackers as white men sporting a badge and other official equipment. When Black people by the thousands demanded that a special prosecutor with a record of respect for Black human rights be appointed, Governor Mario Cuomo refused. And Cuomo, who is considered by many whites to be the great liberal hope for the Democratic Party, has consistently supported the racist media campaign designed to discredit Tawana, her family and the movement supporting her.

In response to these attacks, a militant Black resistance is beginning to emerge. Although it is not consolidated, this movement has mobilized some of the most forceful demonstrations that this country has seen in a decade. For example, this past December 21st, New York's Black community held a Day of Outrage against racist violence. Designed to show the power of a disciplined Black movement, business and transportation services were disrupted across a major portion of the city during rush hour, four days before Christmas. Racist Mayor Ed Koch banned the demonstration and mobilized thousands of police to contain it. As over 1,000 Black people rallied in downtown Brooklyn, the red, black and green flag of Black nationalism flew over the streets. Banners proclaimed: "Carry on the Tradition of Malcolm X: Self-Determination, Self-Defense, Self-Respect." Chanting "NO JUSTICE, NO PEACE," the demonstrators linked arms and moved into the streets. Bridges linking Manhattan and Brooklyn were closed, and hundreds of people poured down onto the subway tracks. With 1.5 million riders unable to move, the system was effectively paralyzed.

What is taking place in New York is perhaps the sharpest example of the anger building in the Black community and the potential power held by a militant Black liberation movement. While it is not yet general-

ized throughout the country, every white person who is against racism needs to take stock of this situation. The past year has brought encouraging signs that white passivity in the face of racism may be changing. At colleges like Columbia and U. Mass. Amherst, white students have come forward in support of Black student leadership in the fight against racism. In April, white students joined with Black students and faculty in a large demonstration to demand an end to white supremacy at Duke University. And in New York City, anti-racist organizers have recently come together to form the Racist Violence Response Network. Committed to solidarity with the struggles of African-Americans and all people of color, this network is educating and mobilizing people, particularly in the white community, to stand up against racist violence. If we are to be a movement for whom justice really matters, beginning efforts like these need to be actively supported by all of us. They are examples of a commitment and consciousness that our movement sorely needs.

But these examples remain too few and far between. All too often it is the lack of consistent opposition by whites to racist violence, coupled with the low priority given to building principled relationships with the independent Black movement, which characterizes most work. In New York, where so many racist attacks are happening, very few whites have come forward to support Black-led demonstrations or develop organizing campaigns against racism within the white community. Earlier this year, a countrywide gathering of 700 student activists from 130 colleges met in Rutgers, New Jersey to launch a national student organization. This meeting was a significant expression of the student movement. But its lack of consciousness about white supremacy was made clear, when a caucus of Black and Third World students criticized those assembled for assuming that a national organization could be built without consulting or involving organizations representing students of color.

This is the year that Jesse Jackson's campaign for the Democratic nomination for president, has touched the frustrations and hopes of millions of Black people. After months of primaries it is becoming clear that the Democrats are unwilling to adopt Jackson's populist program or place him on the ticket in November. In every state, but particularly in the South, where the majority of Black people live, many Black organizations have mobilized for Jackson as an expression of nationalistic pride and to send the message that Black people want empowerment *now*. Many anti-racist white people have been drawn to work on his campaign because it represents an attempt by a progressive Black figure to run for president. Almost without exception the white left has embraced this effort, devoting resources and personnel to the Jackson campaign. For some, working within the Democratic Party is

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

Memorandum

TO : Mr. W. C. Sullivan

FROM : G. C. Moore *gcm*

SUBJECT: COUNTERINTELLIGENCE PROGRAM
BLACK NATIONALIST-HATE GROUPS
RACIAL INTELLIGENCE

DATE: February 23, 1968

1 - Mr. C. D. DeLoach
1 - Mr. W. C. Sullivan
1 - Mr. G. C. Moore
1 - [redacted]
1 - [redacted]

GOALS

1. Prevent the coalition of militant black nationalist groups. In unity there is strength; a truism that is no less valid for all its triteness. An effective coalition of black nationalist

GOALS

1. Prevent the coalition of militant black nationalist groups. In unity there is strength; a truism that is no less valid for all its triteness.
2. Prevent the rise of a "messiah" who could unify, and electrify, the militant black nationalist movement. Malcolm X might have been such a messiah; he is the martyr of the movement today. Martin Luther King, Stokely Carmichael and Elijah Muhammed all aspire to this position.
3. Prevent violence on the part of black nationalist groups.
4. Prevent militant black nationalist groups and leaders from gaining respectability, by discrediting them to the responsible Negro leaders in the white community and Negro radicals.

COINTELPRO document outlining U.S. government war strategy against the Black Liberation Movement.

seen as a way to latch onto the strength of the Black movement and advance an agenda for reform. For others, it represents a long-term strategy, aimed at building up their electoral power base as a prelude to creating an independent working class party, similar to the British Labor Party.

In either case, it means that the particularly acute crisis facing Black people gets downplayed in the push to win white votes. The slogan, "From Racial Battlegrounds—to Economic Common Ground," diverts attention from the fact that white racist violence and genocide are on the upswing. While this strategy has won Jackson more white support than he received in 1984, most polls show that the majority of white Democrats would refuse to vote for a ticket that he ran on.

For Black people, there is no question that, whoever takes the White House in November, conditions will continue deteriorating. The elite-dominated Democratic

Party never has been and never will be a vehicle for fulfilling the radical aspirations and program set forth by the Black struggle of the 1960s. As white supremacy intensifies, so too will Black protest on campuses, in communities, and in the workplace. For white people, struggling within the Democratic Party is no substitute for organizing a dynamic anti-racist movement within our communities and supporting the development of a revolutionary Black resistance.

Sooner or later, the necessity of responding to the demands of the colonized Black Nation for self-determination and an end to racist terror will force its way onto the agenda of the entire left. For some, this may seem an impossible task. But when we look at our movement's history, it is no greater step to begin taking now than it was 25 years ago when a generation of activists responded to the call of Black people to break the chains of white supremacy in our society and in our hearts. □

Can't Kill the Spirit

Political Prisoners & POWs Update



Anti-Imperialists Indicted in Capitol Bombing

On May 25, seven North American activists were arraigned in federal court in Washington, D.C. on charges of conspiracy and bombings against political and military targets between 1983-85. Those indicted are Marilyn Buck, Linda Evans, Laura Whitehorn, Susan Rosenberg, Timothy Blunk, Alan Berkman, and Elizabeth Duke. All except Elizabeth Duke are currently in prison.

The attacks alleged in the indictment include a series of bombings protesting U.S. military involvement in the Caribbean and in Central America: the U.S. Capitol, following the invasion of Grenada in 1983; the National War College at Fort McNair; the Washington Navy Yard Computer Center; and the Washington Navy Yard Officer Club. In addition, the charges include an attack on the Israeli Aircraft Industries Building to protest U.S. complicity with the Israeli invasion of Lebanon; an attack on the South African consulate; and an attack on the Patrolmen's Benevolent Association in New York City, following a series of police murders of Black people in New York, which culminated with the murder of an elderly Black woman, Eleanor Bumpers.

The arraignment took place in an ultra-high security courtroom, ringed with guards and with bullet-proof glass separating the defendants from the spectators, like in South Africa. Objecting to the military atmosphere of the hearing, the six stated that they were political prisoners, not terrorists. Dr. Berkman described the conditions under which they are being held at the Washington, D.C. County Jail as intolerable violations of the most elementary human rights. They are kept in their cells for 71 hours

at a time, then released for a single hour in which to shower and make a phone call. And their right to prepare for trial is being obstructed by the government.

In a statement released at the arraignment, family and friends of the defendants pointed to the hypocrisy in the U.S. government's "human rights" rhetoric:

In this very courthouse Oliver North will also be tried. Look at the difference in how the government deals with those responsible for its oppressive policies versus those who resist them! Oliver North *carried out* the foreign and domestic policies of the U.S. government through violent and illegal means. Oliver North is responsible for thousands of deaths in the Contra war. His operations were funded not only by illegal arms sales, but by the deadly traffic of cocaine and crack in our communities. Oliver North is called a hero. Our loved ones are labeled terrorists, and are held under intolerable conditions...

The government is doing this to dehumanize these people in the eyes of the public and make them feared and hated. They hope that no one will care if their human rights are violated in this legal farce of a trial or behind prison walls.


These comrades are part of our movement, part of an on-going resistance in this country to U.S.-sponsored genocide in Central America, the Middle East, and the Black community here at home. They are political prisoners who are being denied their most basic human rights and they deserve our support.

For more information contact: The Committee to Fight Repression, P.O. Box 1435, Cathedral Station, New York, NY 10025.

Mutulu Shakur and Marilyn Buck Convicted

In one of the most extraordinary political trials of the 80s, Mutulu Shakur and Marilyn Buck were convicted on May 11 in New York City of sweeping charges under the RICO (Racketeering Influenced Corrupt Organizations) Law. Allegations included the liberation of Assata Shakur from prison in 1979 and participation in several political expropriations, including the Brinks expropriation in Nyack, NY in October of 1981. The purpose of these expropriations, as explained in a communique released after the attempt, was to fund institutions and grassroots efforts in the Black community and to build a clandestine apparatus for Black liberation in this country.

Rejecting government attempts to portray them as criminals, the defendants affirmed that these actions were political acts of armed resistance by legitimate New Afrikan freedom fighters and, as such, were not subject to criminal prosecution. Under international law, combatants captured in struggles for self-determination against colonial domination are to be treated as Prisoners of War. Dr. Shakur claimed that his long history in the Black



the police, FBI and COINTELPRO in framing or assassinating virtually every Black leader of the 60s and 70s.

Geronimo Pratt, one of the longest-held political prisoners in the U.S., testified about his frame-up, the infiltration of his defense team, the perjured testimony of FBI informants, and the continuous intervention by the government to keep him in prison after 18 years. Kwame Turé (Stokely Carmichael), a former leader of SNCC and the Black Power movement, submitted evidence concerning FBI COINTELPRO documents which singled him out as someone whose leadership must be prevented at any cost. Imari Obadeli, former President of the Provisional Government of the Republic of New Afrika, described a predawn assault by police and FBI agents on the RNA headquarters in Jackson, Mississippi in August 1971. Eleven RNA sympathizers, the RNA-11, were arrested and served long jail terms. New Afrikan activist and cultural worker, Fulani Sunni-Ali, testified about the raid ten years later on a farmhouse in Mississippi in which she was living with other women and children. Hundreds of police, helicopters, and even a tank swept down on her home in a massive military-style assault in the aftermath of the Brinks expropriation. Charges were later dropped against her, but while she was in custody, she was told that other comrades were targeted for death. She was subsequently jailed for a year for refusing to testify before a grand jury investigating the Black Liberation Movement.

The conviction on all counts means that Shakur and Buck face sentences of up to 40 years. Sentencing is set for July 28. Supporters are asked to write letters to Judge Charles Haight, reasserting the fact that Marilyn Buck and Mutulu Shakur are not criminals, but political people committed to changing conditions of oppression, and therefore should receive light sentences. The letters should be sent care of their attorneys, Judy Holmes and Soffiyah Elijah, 120 Duane St. #400, New York, NY 10007.



freedom struggle motivated the attack against him and entitled him to P.O.W. status. He was a founding member of the Provisional Government of the Republic of New Afrika and a co-founder of the National Task Force for COINTELPRO Litigation and Research, as well as a founder and Director of the Black Acupuncture Advisory Association of North America (BAANA), a community clinic in Harlem. Marilyn Buck has been an activist in the anti-imperialist and Black solidarity movement for over twenty years.

The trial quickly became an oral history of the Black liberation struggle itself. Witnesses testified about the rise of the Black Liberation Movement and the simultaneous development of official state terror to destroy it. A number of people, including political prisoners and P.O.W.s, testified from their own direct experience about the role of

Independentista Resists Grand Jury

On May 23, Nelson Ramirez, an unaffiliated independentista in the Puerto Rican community in New York, was subpoenaed to a federal grand jury investigating the Puerto Rican Independence Movement. This new grand jury, empanelled in March of this year, is allegedly investigating actions of the Fuerzas Armadas de Liberación Nacional (FALN). Upholding the position of non-collaboration, Nelson has refused to turn over handwriting and voice exemplars to the grand jury. He has been found in civil contempt by Judge Platt.

Nelson stated that the U.S. had no moral or legal right to be questioning him or any Puerto Ricans about the activities of the independence movement. He noted the pressure exerted by the FBI to get him to cooperate. Nelson's wife is in her seventh month of a high-risk pregnancy and his jailing (scheduled to take place on his wife's birthday, June 15th) will prevent him from being present at the birth of his daughter. The authorities were aware of these facts when they subpoenaed him. Nevertheless, he reaffirmed his commitment to the independence of Puerto Rico and assured us that the government would fail in its objectives.

Puerto Ricans Sentenced in "Conspiracy to Escape" Trial

On December 31, 1987, the jury in the FBI-concocted "Conspiracy to Escape" case returned guilty verdicts against Puerto Rican activists Jaime Delgado and Dora García, Puerto Rican Prisoner of War Oscar López-Rivera, and New Afrikan Political Prisoner Kojo Bomaní-Sababu. The defense had submitted overwhelming evidence that it was, in fact, the U.S. government which had created, funded and sustained the so-called conspiracy to liberate López-Rivera from Leavenworth Federal Penitentiary. (See Breakthrough Fall 1987.)

On February 26, Federal Judge William T. Hart sentenced Oscar López-Rivera to 15 years and Kojo Bomaní-Sababu to five years (to run consecutively to Oscar's 55-year sentence for seditious conspiracy and Kojo's sentence of life imprisonment). Jaime Delgado, former Coordinator of the National Committee to Free Puerto Rican Prisoners of War, was sentenced to four years imprisonment, to be followed by five years probation. Dora García, a pro-independence activist, was given three years imprisonment, followed by five years probation.



International Campaign to Shut Down Lexington Builds

The campaign to close the Lexington Control Unit—a special prison for the isolation and torture of six women prisoners—is gaining strength. In a dramatic development last April, Soviet Foreign Minister Shevardnadze, in a pre-Summit planning meeting, read out loud from the ACLU's report condemning the Control Unit. This sent the State Department scurrying for more information. Although not covered by the U.S. media, the Soviets have cited issues like Lexington, the Puerto Rican POWs and imprisoned Native American leader Leonard Peltier as a counter to Reagan's hypocritical posturing about human rights violations in the U.S.S.R.

Partially in response to the continued mistreatment of Puerto Rican POW Alejandrina Torres in the Control Unit (along with North American revolutionaries Silvia Baraldini and Susan Rosenberg and three other women) the House of the Puerto Rican legislature has passed a bill denouncing Lexington. On June 17, lawyers fighting to close the Unit addressed a full session of the Puerto Rican Bar Association. In further developments, the Human Rights Commission in Geneva, the National Council of Churches, the World Council of Churches and a number of Latin American human rights organizations have taken an active interest in this issue.

On the home front, pressure on the Bureau of Prisons is mounting. The National Campaign to Abolish the Lexington Control Unit, the ACLU, the Center for Constitutional Rights and other lawyers have sued the Bureau and Attorney General Edward Meese for maintaining an experimental psychological torture unit at Lexington with the objectives of destroying the personalities of the political prisoners and altering and controlling their behavior.

Recently, the government announced that they would close the Unit in July and transfer the six women and many other political prisoners and Prisoners of War to a special new 108-bed women's prison currently under construction in Marianna, Florida. The National Campaign to Abolish the Lexington Women's Control Unit (294 Atlantic Ave., Brooklyn, NY 11201) is gearing up for an all-out fight to block its opening.

Mexico won't Extradite Morales!

As we go to press, we have just learned that the government of Mexico has refused U.S. requests to extradite Puerto Rican Patriot William Guillermo Morales. This important victory follows years of international pressure to get political asylum for Morales, who escaped from U.S. Federal prison in May 1979.

Ohio-7 Fight Seditious Conspiracy

The following article was submitted to Breakthrough by Ray Levasseur and edited due to space constraints.

The Ohio-7 are Raymond Luc Levasseur, Patricia Levasseur, Thomas Manning, Carol Manning, Barbara Curzi-Laaman, Jaan Laaman and Richard Williams. All are from working class backgrounds and have a long



The Ohio-7: (left to right, Jaan Laaman, Barbara Curzi-Laaman, Carol Manning, Tom Manning, Pat Levasseur, Raymond Luc Levasseur, behind, Richard Williams)

history of political activism.

In May, 1986 the Ohio 7 were indicted on seditious conspiracy and two counts of RICO (Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations). The government has charged the seven with being part of two clandestine, revolutionary organizations: the Sam Melville-Jonathon Jackson Unit and/or United Freedom Front. These organizations claimed credit for numerous bombings of u.s. military facilities and corporations from 1976 through 1984. These actions were done in support of the Puerto Rican Independence struggle, the Black Liberation struggle and in solidarity with liberation movements in Southern Africa and Central America.

The Ohio-7's response at their arraignment was to state that they are guilty of no crimes and that it is the united states government that should be on trial for war crimes and crimes against humanity.

In an historical precedent the government has for the first time in history used the seditious conspiracy law against North American revolutionaries. Prior to the

present indictment, seditious conspiracy had only been used against the Puerto Rican Independence Movement. This is a political prosecution that bears close watching by all progressive and revolutionary people because it is a further attempt by the government to enforce what it defines as the only acceptable methods of social and political change that oppressed people can utilize in their

struggle. Secondly, this prosecution is a litmus test to see what level of repression the Movement can be subjected to and pave the way for more prosecutions of those not necessarily associated with clandestine organizations.

Under the seditious conspiracy law you can be convicted for conspiring (i.e. agreeing) to overthrow or oppose by force the government's authority or to delay the execution of *any* law of the u.s. It is conceivable under this law that someone like Brian Willson and friends who attempt to disrupt the flow of weapons to Central America by blocking u.s.

munitions trains could be indicted for seditious conspiracy. That time may come if the government is successful in its prosecution of the Ohio-7.

With every serious attempt to advance the struggle for human rights, political movements in the u.s. have been subjected to vicious attacks and criminal prosecutions which are intended to neutralize organizations and leadership. Conspiracy/seditious prosecutions challenge the ability and willingness of the movement to defend itself. We must fight back. The class and national struggles from which the Ohio-7 base their commitment to revolutionary change cannot be divorced from the trial itself, for these are the central political issues under attack.

The Ohio-7 are motivated by their love for oppressed people, a vision of a better world for all our children and a commitment to fight injustice. If there is not common ground to be had with others based within this very human sentiment, then it can be said that fascism is beginning to eclipse the will of the people to fight for their rights.

WRITE THROUGH THE WALLS

The U.S. government says there are no political prisoners or POWs in this country. Yet the partial list below shows this claim is a complete lie. We urge you to write them and to send literature. These women and men represent the best of the movement. Make their struggle yours. "The Real Dragon" sponsors a continuing book drive to political prisoners and POWs. For more information or to send contributions write: POB 3294, Berkeley, CA 94703-9901.

Puerto Rican Prisoners of War

William Guillermo Morales
Apartado Postal 20-853
Col. San Angel
Mexico 20 DF, MEXICO

Ricardo Jiménez #88967-024
Alberto Rodríguez #92150-024
Edwin Cortés #92153-024
PO Box 1000
Lewisburg PA 17837

Carlos Alberto Torres #88976-024
FCI 902 Renfro
Talladega AL 35160

Alejandrina Torres #92152-024
HSU Lexington
Box 2000
Lexington KY 40511

Luis Rosa #NO2743
Box 711
Menard IL 62259

Elizarn Escobar #88969-024
FCI Colorado Unit
PO Box 1500
El Reno OK 73036

Alicia Rodríguez #NO7157
PO Box 5007
Dwight IL 60420

Oscar López-Rivera #87651-024
PO Box 1000
Marion IL 62959

Adolfo Matos #88968-024
3901 Klein Blvd.
Lompoc CA 93438

Haydée Torres #88462-024
Ida Luz Rodríguez #88973-024
Dylcia Pagán #88971-024
Carmen Valentín #88974-024
PCI Pleasanton
5701 8th Street
Camp Parks
Dublin CA 94568

Puerto Rican Political Prisoners

Filiberto Ojeda-Ríos #03167-069
Hartford FDC
PO Box 178
Hartford, CT 06141

Julio Veras y Degadillo #00799-069
PO Box 1000
Petersburg VA 23803

Jaine Delgado #94736-024
P.O. Box 33
Terre Haute, IN 47808

Dora García #94735-024
5701 8th St. Camp Parks
Dublin, CA 94566

New Afrikan/Black POWs and Political Prisoners

Kalima Aswad #B24120
s/n Robert Duren
PO box 8108 Dorm 13-H
San Luis Obispo CA 93409-0001

Mutulu Shakur #83205-012
150 Park Row
New York NY 10007

Jalil A. Muntaqin #77-A-4283
s/n Anthony Bottom
Adbul Majid #83-A-483
s/n Anthony LaBorde
Robert Seth Haycs #74-A-2280
Drawer B
Stormville NY 12582

Herman Bell #79-A-262
Basheer Hameed #82-A-6313
s/n James York
PO Box 7000
Wallkill, NY 12589

Richard Dhoruba Moore #72-A-0639
Box A.G.
Fallburg, NY 12733

Albert Nuh Washington #77-A-1528
Mohamam Koti #80-A-808
135 State St.
Auburn, NY 13023-9000

Jaha/n Teddy Heath #75-A-0139
PO Box 338
Napanoch, NY 12458

Gerónimo ji Jaga Pratt #B40319
Tamal CA 94974

Cecilio Chui Ferguson #04372-054
Kazi Toure s/n Chris King
FCI
PO Box 1000
Lewisburg PA 17837

Sundiata Acoli #39794-066
s/n Clark Squire
Sekou Odinga #05228-054
s/n Nathaniel Burns
PO Box 1000
Leavenworth, KS 66048

Richard Thompson-El #20080-101
James "Blood" Miller #00124-054
Koyo Boman Sababu #39384-66
s/n Graling Brown
PO Box 1000
Marion IL 62959

Mondo Langa
s/n David Rice
PO Box 2500
Lincoln NE 68502-0500

Johnny Imani Harris #2-373s
Sekou Kambui
s/n William Turk
Holman Prison Unit
Aumore AL 36503

Richard Mafundi Lake #79972
100 Warrior Lane #1-43B
Bessemer AL 35023

Mark Cook #20025-148(H)
3901 Klein Blvd.
Lompoc CA 93438

Awali Stoneham #B-98168
Soledad CA 93960

Ruchell Cinque Magee #A92051
Haki Malik Abdullah #C-56123
s/n Michael Green
Repress CA 95671

Hugo Pined #A88401
IV B6-C203
PO Box 1902B
Tehachapi, CA 93561

Maliki Shakur Laine #81-A-4469
PO Box 338
Napanoch, NY 12458

Ed Poindexter
7525 4th Ave.
Lino Lake, MN 55014

Thomas Warner #M3049
Drawer R
Huntington PA 16652

Sababu Na Uhuru #07350-016
s/n William Stoner
L.C.P.
730 E. Walnut St.
Lebanon, PA 17042

Rickie Green #84244
PO Box 97
McAlester OK 74502

Move Prisoners

Debbie Sims Africa #6307
Consusuela Dotson Africa
Ramona Johnson Africa #7564
Alberta Wicker Africa
Janine Phillips Africa
Merle Austin Africa #6306
Janet Holloway Africa
PO Box 180
Muncy PA 17756

Charles Sims Africa #M4975
Delbert Orr Africa #M4985
Carlos Perez Africa #M7400
Drawer K
Dallas, PA 18612-0286

William Phillips Africa #M4984
Edward Goodman Africa #4974
PO Box 200
Camp Hill, PA 17011

Mumia Abu Jamal
Michael Hill Africa #M4973
Drawer R
Huntington, PA 16652

Native American Prisoners of War and Political Prisoners

Leonard Peltier #89637-132
PO Box 1000
Leavenworth KS 66048

Standing Deer #83947
s/n Robert Hugh Wilson
E. Block Box 97
McAlester OK 74501

Rita Silk Naomi
Box 11492
Mable Basset Corr. Inst.
Oklahoma City OK 73136

North American Political Prisoners

Judy Clark #83-G-313
MCC
8901 S. Wilmont
Tucson, AZ 85706

Kathy Boudin #84-G-171
247 Harris Road
Bedford Hills NY 10507

Marilyn Buck
Laura Whitehorn #220-858
Susan Rosenberg #233-411
Linda Evans #233-411
Tim Blunk #233-410
Alan Beckman #233-315
D.C. Jail
1901 D St. SE
Washington, DC 20003

David Gilbert #83-A-6158
Box 367B Main
Dannemora NY 12929

Silvia Baraldini #05125-054
HSU Lexington
Box 2000
Lexington KY 40511

Richard Picariello #05812
PO Box 100
South Walpole MA 02071

Ed Mead #251397
PO Box 777
Monroe, WA 98272

Ohio 7

Thomas Manning #10373-016
Richard Williams #10377-016
Barbara Curzi-Laaman #18213-053
Jean Laaman #10372-016
Raymond Levasseur #10376-016
Carol Manning #10375-016
PO Box 178
Hartford, CT 06141

Pat Levasseur c/o Sedition Committee
PO Box 4690
Springfield, MA 01101

Ploughshares/Disarmament Prisoners

Fr. Carl Kabat #03230-045
Jerry Ebner
PO Box 1000
Sandstone, MN 55072

Richard Miller #15249-077
PO Box 33, Unit 1-D
Terre Haute, IN 47808

Helen Woodson #03231-045
c/o C. Dixon
622 Water St.
Ashland, WI 54806

Jean Gump #03789-045
Box A
Alderson VA 24910

Joe Gump #03789-045
PO Box 1085
Oxford, WI 53952

Lin Romano #37168-066
PCI Lexington
3301 Leestown Rd.
Lexington, KY 40511

Jim Albertini
c/o Ann Albertini
PO Box AB
Kurtistown, HI 96760

George Ostensen
c/o Sts Peter & Paul Church
Rt. 3, Box 324
Ashland, WI 54806

Katya Komisaruk
PO Box 19202
Spokane, WA 99219

Vanconver 4

Doug Stewart
Matsqui Medium Institution
Box 4000
Abbotsford, BC, CANADA V2S4P3

Ana Hansen
Prison for Women
Box 515
Kingston, ONT, CANADA K7L4W7

Brent Taylor
PO Box 190
Kingston, ONT, CANADA K7L4V9

Irish Prisoners

Joseph Doherty #07792-0545
MCC-9 South
150 Park Row
New York, NY 10007

Gabriel Megahay #04679-054
PO Box 1000
Otisville, NY 10969

Break Through the Information Blockade

Find out why the FMLN says "El Salvador está venciendo." Subscribe to VENCEREMOS, the bi-monthly journal of the FMLN.

Now available for the first time in English.

For one year's subscription, send \$20.00 check or money order to:

Venceremos Publications

P.O. Box 2104, Church Street Station

New York, NY 10008

★ **Venceremos**

OFFICIAL PUBLICATION OF THE FARABUNDO MARTI NATIONAL LIBERATION FRONT OF EL SALVADOR

Program and Ideology
of the MLN

FIRST CONGRESS
OF THE
MOVIMIENTO DE LIBERACION
NACIONAL PUERTORRIQUEÑO (MLN)



TEN YEARS OF UNCEASING STRUGGLE
1977-1987

"Transforming Defeats into Victories"
"Sowing the Seeds of the New Society"
"Forming the New Woman and the New Man"
"Within the Belly of the Beast"

July 3-5, 1987, Chicago, IL

The program of the Movimiento
de Liberación Nacional Puertorriqueño

Available August 1st from
MLN Program
c/o Editorial Coquí
1671 N. Claremont
Chicago, IL 60647

Spanish and English \$5.00

EL SALVADOR

"The secret of our growing strength lies in our ability to carry out our struggle on multiple and coordinated fronts. We are capable of struggling in the streets, alongside the people; we can operate on the tactical and strategic levels; and we can combine the political with the military aspects of the struggle. Our strength is the joint efforts of thousands of cadres and combatants, who operate inside and outside the country, and who are united under one political line and one flag....

We are ready for victory. The demands of the struggle in 1988 will submit our forces and capacity to the maximum test.

We struggle to win; a people such as ours deserves victory."



—from 1987: Political/Military Appraisal, FMLN General Command

***Stop All Aid
to the Death Squad Regime!
VICTORY TO THE FMLN/FDR!***



STOP ISRAELI TERROR
PALESTINE LIVES

